Appeal for Unity in the Faith

2917
239.

Francis J. Hall
May 31, 1916

Class 280.2R Book P51
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE. NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Rev. F. J. Hall, D.D.

29
23

An Appeal for Unity in Faith

BEING AN APPEAL TO

Anglicans
(Protestant Episcopalians)
and
Protestants of Other Denominations
to Return to the Unity of the Faith

"Thy Kingdom Come"

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism"—Eph. 4:5
"Without faith it is impossible to please God"—Heb. 11:6
"Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith"—
11 Cor. 13:5, King James Ver.

By REV. JOHN PHELAN

M. A. DONOHUE & COMPANY
CHICAGO

280.2R D
P51

Our Holy Father, Pius X, blesses this Appeal

Reverend dear Sir:

I beg leave to inform you that the Cardinal Secretary of State, by a letter dated 9th October, 1911, directs me to convey to you the thanks and the Apostolic Benediction of the Holy Father, in return for your expressions of filial devotion and for the copy which you sent him of your "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," which pleasing duty I herewith fulfill.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
D. FALCONIO,
Apostolic Delegate.

65458

Nihil Obstat:

F. X. Feuerstein
Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur:

Philip Joseph
Bishop of Sioux City

Second Edition
Revised and Enlarged

COPYRIGHT 1911
BY M. A. DONOHUE & Co.
CHICAGO

WASHINGTON D.C.
THEOL. MAR 27 '19
LIBRARY

COMMENDATIONS FROM THE HIERARCHY.

Rev. John Phelan, Grand Junction, Iowa.

Rev. and Dear Sir: I thank you for the copy of your "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," which you have so kindly sent me; and I trust that its earnest pages will do much to remove misunderstandings, and to smooth, in some degree, the pathway to that religious unity which was, and is, God's plan for the world.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
D. FALCONIO, Apostolic Delegate.

My Dear Father Phelan: I have read the "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," of which you are the author, with great interest and profit. It certainly leaves nothing on the subject unsaid, and will do much good in furthering the cause of Christian Union. Yours truly in Xto.,
J. A. QUIGLEY, Archbishop of Chicago.

My Dear Father: I received some time ago while absent from the city a copy of your "Appeal for Unity in the Faith." The title and subject matter of your book are both very opportune. I have not been able to read it carefully, but I see enough to make it worthy of special commendation.

And as you have the approval of your own Bishop, I gladly join him, wishing you at the same time all good wishes. Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. GLENNON, Archbishop of St. Louis.

Rev., Dear Father: I thank you very much for your kindness in sending me a copy of your book—"The Appeal"—and I congratulate you on the authorship of the book. The arguments for church union are well chosen, based upon strong scriptural and historical evidences, and robed in the courteous form which ought to win the attention even of those who are outside of the bosom of the one Church. To Catholics who should pray and work that other sheep be brought within the fold of the one shepherd, the book will be of great value. Please order your publisher to send me five copies, enclosing bill of cost. Very sincerely,
JOHN IRELAND, Archbishop of St. Paul.

Rev., Dear Father: I write to thank you sincerely for the copy of "An Appeal for Unity in Faith," which you sent me. It is an excellent book, in which you bring out clearly the great principles in which Unity and Faith should be based. Sincerely yours in Xto.,
HENRY MOELLER, Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Rev., Dear Sir: His Grace, the most Rev. Archbishop, thanks you for the copy of your book, "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," and requests me to say that since receiving it that he has been so busy with the affairs of his office that he has been unable to do more than let his eyes run over the pages of your interesting volume. From this glance, however, he can see the wealth of material which you have gathered together, and realize the earnest appeal in which you have presented it. It is his hope that

the book, written with so much Christian spirit, may do much to further the great cause for which you have written it. I am,

Very truly yours,
CHAS. A. RAMM,
Secretary to the Archbishop of San Francisco.

Dear Father Phelan: I am very thankful to you for your kind remembrance in sending me your splendid publication, "An Appeal for Unity in the Faith." I certainly will be glad to promote the good cause in every possible way.

I remember Cardinal Vaughan always maintained that the only effective way to bring it about was by individual effort. He had much to do with the movement for Unity in England and spoke from long experience.

The parish priest in his daily work and by his tact, kindness and true priestly and gracious personality, backed up by sufficient ability to present the teachings of faith in a clear and convincing manner, is the one power under the grace of God who can do the best work in the great cause. He comes closer to the people than any other man in the service of God.

I hope your worthy efforts in this matter will be fruitful of good results.

Wishing you the blessing of God,

Your servant in Christ,
JAMES J. HARTLEY, Bishop of Columbus.

Rev., Dear Sir: I thank you for the copy of your "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," which I have read with great interest. No Priest of God could do work more agreeable to the Heart of Jesus Christ, and more useful to the christian body of believers, than to further Unity in the Church of Christ of the various denominations. A necessary preparation of that consummation devoutly to be wished is to remove unreasoning prejudice, and the memory of the wrongs perpetrated in the faith against believers. Man is swayed by sentiment, even more than by reason; given an unbiased mind and a prayerful soul; the truth must convince every man of good will. What more clear than that:

1. There is only one God who revealed Himself to us, here.
2. There is and can be only one truth; unchangeable and eternal.
3. Christ, the Son of God, has founded only one church to teach that one immutable truth to man.
4. Christ left to that church, in the person of the Apostles and their legitimate successors, the Divine means to teach the truth and to apply by the sacraments He established, the fruits of His Redemption to mankind.
5. Christ lives in His Church and He sent God the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, to abide with her until the consummation of ages; hence that Church can never change, never err, never end until time is no more.
6. That Church of God, the Column of Truth, was the Holy Catholic Church in the beginning, hence it is the one Church today.

May God speed your good work and bless with abundant Fruit of Unity, your generous efforts to bring America and England into the one true fold of Christ.

Devotedly yours in Christ,
CAMILLUS PAUL, Bishop of Covington.

Sincerely and Devotedly

Dedicated

to

All Lovers of Truth

To Those of The Household of The Faith, *that they may the more appreciate the solid principles that underlie their belief, and which justify and impel this appeal:*

To Those not of The Household, *hoping that these pages may enable them to solve their doubts, or may help them to find out, and submit to their Divinely appointed Teacher: and thus obtaining the true faith, enjoy the blessings and advantages of being in the one fold under the One Shepherd. And the better to obtain this happy result we earnestly entreat the reader to have recourse to God by fervent prayer for light and grace.*

PRAYER FOR LIGHT.

(Recited by Rev. John Thayer, a Puritan Minister of Boston.)

Almighty and eternal God, Father of mercy, Saviour of mankind, I humbly entreat Thee by Thy sovereign goodness to enlighten my mind, and to touch my heart, that by true faith, hope and charity, I may live and die in the true religion of Jesus Christ. I am sure that as there is but one true God, so there can be but one faith, one religion, one way of salvation, and that every other way which is opposite to this can only lead to endless misery. It is this faith, O my God, which I earnestly desire to embrace, in order to save my soul. I protest, therefore, before Thy divine Majesty, and I declare by all Thy divine attributes, that I will follow that religion which Thou shalt show me to be true; and that I will abandon, at whatever cost, that in which I shall discover error and falsehood. I do not deserve, it is true, this favor, on account of the greatness of my sins, for which I have a profound sorrow, because they offended a God so good, so great, so holy and worthy of my love; but what I do not deserve, I hope to obtain from Thy infinite mercy, and I conjure Thee to grant through the merits of the Precious Blood which was shed for us poor sinners by Thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

(Reader you won't be surprised to learn that the outpourings of this noble soul were heard. He received the gift of the true faith, was received into the Catholic Church.)

NOTANDA.

In the following pages we write the Apostle of England, Augustine, to distinguish him from Austin or Augustin, the Doctor of Grace, the great Bishop of Hippo.

In lawsuit or illness we seek the advice and guidance of a lawyer or doctor, because our temporal or physical needs demand attention. But in the greater concern—the religious life—where the eternal and spiritual are involved, persons are indifferent, or neglectful, or disdainful. "What fools these mortals be."

The very nature of truth demands Unity. And if this be so regarding truth in general, it particularly holds good regarding truth divinely revealed.

What the Redeemer taught or revealed: how we can know with certainty what this doctrine is; are the two great guiding principles in the following pages.

God is truth—all truth, therefore He cannot contradict Himself. He is the creator of reason, the Author of revelation. Between these two lights to man—the real facts discovered by human reason and supernatural truths —there cannot be any conflict, because God, the source of both lights, cannot contradict Himself.

Christ said to the stricken Saul, "Why persecutest thou Me?"—thus identifying Himself with the Christians. Here we have a sublime truth involved. Christ and those constituting His Church are one. No wonder that Paul afterwards alluded to the Church as the mystical Body of Christ. Christ and His Church are One.

As the one divine faith is foreign to no country, so the Church, the custodian of that world-wide faith, is foreign to no country. She has no frontier lines. Every nation is a province in the mighty kingdom of the Church.

For distinction sake we sometimes make use of the expression Roman Catholic Church. The official title of the Church is Catholic and Roman. Roman because there resides the visible head of the Kingdom that extends from ocean to ocean.

Taking into account man's depravity and free will we see that the Apostles could not give to the world a sinless Church, for they had their Judas. Why, therefore, find fault with the Church in subsequent ages—on this heading?

The poor Pagan asks today, "Who is Jesus?" "What is Christianity." The sects say He is this, or He is that; but the Church to which Peter belongs says, as Peter said of old, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And furthermore she says, "Here are His revealed truths—here are the facts of faith—the truths of Christianity."

We request the reader to give due respect to the claims of the Church. Her devoted Sons wrote the New Testament which she pronounced inspired, and endorsed and preserved it. Anyone reading its sacred pages ought to be impressed with the evidence given therein of her existence and Divine authority as a teaching organization, before a line of it was written.

Unity in faith, conformity to our Saviour's plan, would confer the greatest blessing on humanity this twentieth century.

To try to limit the endowments, conferred on the Church or corporate body by Him, who is ever present with that body, is manifestly wrong, and the Chief Pastorate conferred on Peter is one of these endowments.

"Violated the unity," "ruined the unity;" such expressions have reference to those becoming separated from unity. Attacks on the faith, evidently, do not constitute multifarious faiths. Such faiths should be wisely regarded as spurious. And the essential unity of the Church, of course, will ever remain intact. "Is Christ divided?"

We regret those inconsistent beings—bad Catholics. We realize that bad, unworthy Catholics are a hindrance to persons joining the Church, but it must never be forgotten that a million unworthy Catholics are not a synonym for the Church teaching; nor are their immoralities a cancellation of her Charter.

Since the invisible God became visible, the God-Man amongst men, in order to teach men the truths of salvation, he requires men to give such a visible, outward manifestation of this internal belief so as to be a clear, convincing sign of His mission, His unified, His Divine teaching. How is this wonder, this visible unity to be effected and maintained? Only by persons becoming members of the Church, and thus speaking through the mouth, and seeing with the eyes of the Church.

The Bishop of Rome is Bishop of the Diocese or Vicariate of Rome, and also head of the Universal Church.

The Primacy conferred by Christ on St. Peter has continued to our day in the Catholic Church and in no other; no, not even claimed by any other.

Paul rebuked Peter. What if he did? Too much capital is made out of this incident by people who constantly read of rebukes and censures and criticisms by National Senators and Congressmen on their Chief—their Ruler—the Head of the Nation—the President. Let it be emphasized that St. Paul rebuked St. Peter not for what he **taught,** but for what he **did.**

The Pope is over the whole Church, the Bishop over a diocese, the priest over a parish. And yet in this triple headship in a parish there is no more conflict than in a city, although under a Mayor, Governor or President. A similarity in government, but with a difference as to the source of authority. It may be said that in the former case authority is from on high, in the latter from below (from the people).

"God wills Unity." Consider it a pleasure to promote Christ's wish in Christ's way! Working for Christian Unity is a most convincing sign of our kinship with Christ.

The Jews had the Sacred Writings and yet they did not recognize the Messias. "There hath stood one in the midst of you whom you know not." (St. John 1:26.) Neither do persons with the Sacred Writings in their hands recognize the representative of the Messias in their midst today.

We don't have to be told that Christ is the Chief cornerstone. (Eph. 2:19, 20.) We know this, but this does not preclude a secondary cornerstone or foundation, nay, the text implies a secondary foundation.

We don't have to be reminded "that Christ is the head of the Church" (Eph. 5:23)—"that the head of every man is Christ" (1 Cor. 11:3), while claiming that Peter is the head in a vicarial sense.

Nor do we have to be reminded that Christ is the Good Shepherd when we say that He gave his flock in care of Peter. Nor to be reminded that He is still the King in the Kingdom, although He gave the keys to Peter.

"Where Jesus is, there is the Church." All Christians must accept Jesus. He is, of course, the great center of Unity. By accepting Jesus we not only mean to acknowledge Him as God and recognize Him as the Saviour; but also to accept all His Divine teaching, His Divine revelation, His commands. Also to accept the arrangements He made to maintain this true heavenly doctrine—that is, the Chief Pastorate—the vicegerency—the Papacy.

As Washington gave this country a Constitution and a Government, so also did Christ give the Kingdom of God on earth—the Church, a Constitution and a Government. This original Constitution is substantially recorded in the New Testament.

"The things which thou hast heard from me, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also."—II. Tim. 2:2. In these words of St. Paul to Timothy we see three generations of the Apostolic Succession, and we see the Christian plan of learning the truths of salvation. And on the death of Timothy we find St. John taking charge of the See of Ephesus.

Who will see that what Christ taught be **observed?** Who will see that vacancies in His Sacred Ministry are filled as the Apostles did in the case of Barnabas?

Who will deliver to the faithful the decrees to keep? Who will ordain persons unto the Ministry of reconciliation and see that the ministry be duly exercised and not abused?

Who will personally convey today the power to celebrate the Divine mysteries, a power personally conveyed to the Apostles by Jesus personally?

Who will exercise authority in case of him "who revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ?" Where is the divinely constituted organization called the Church which our Saviour instituted to save me? These are questions we implore our readers to take to their hearts and hope that these pages may be serviceable to answer them.

Jesus is our center of union, of course. All Christians have accepted Jesus, but evidently not fully. We must accept Jesus, His teaching and arrangements. We must accept the Church that tells us about Jesus, His doctrine and arrangements. The Church consists of the teacher and the taught; the pastors and the flock. The Church is the Christian flock under lawful pastors under the Chief Pastorate. The Church, or the true Christian fold possesses or should possess, unity of faith and worship, unity of communion and government. Government is vested in the Chief Pastorate—the Papacy, for the purpose of maintaining unity.

"The true union between Christians is that which Jesus Christ, the Author of the Church, instituted and desired, and which consists in a unity of faith and a unity of government."—Ency. Leo XIII on "Re-union of Christendom" June 20, 1894.

"For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." (I Tim. 2:3, 4.)

AN URGENT REQUEST.

For the love of God, the souls of men, and your own spiritual benefit, your earnest, hearty, and prayerful co-operation is requested, along with that of Christians of every denomination to effect the success of this Appeal for unity, going forth from the land whose motto is "E pluribus unum;" so as to overcome, amongst English speaking people, the obstacles to the prayer and wish of our Divine Savior for unity amongst these various Christians.

Daily you address God that "His kingdom come; His will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." And you know it is Our Divine Redeemer's will and prayer that His kingdom prevail, not to be harassed by rival kingdoms, or rebellions, but that His followers be characterized by unity. And knowing this, be honorable enough and Christian enough to endeavor sincerely to have the Divine will fulfilled in you by seeking and observing this unity of faith, if you be not within the one fold already.

"I desire therefore, first of all that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men;

"For kings, and for all that are in high station; that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life in all piety and chastity;

"For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour,

"Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." (I Tim. 2:1, 4.)

FAITH.

"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."
St. Mark 16:16.

"And this is the victory which overcometh the world, our faith."—1 St. John, 5:4.

"In all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one."—Eph. 6:16.

"Faith is to believe, on the word of God, what we do not see, and its reward is to see and enjoy what we believe."—St. Augustin.

"Things of God that are marvellous are to be believed on a principle of faith, not to be pried into by reason. For if reason set them before our eyes, they would be no longer marvellous.—St. Gregory.

Faith as Others See it.

As the flower is before the fruit, so is faith before good works.—Whately.

Faith and works are like the light and heat of a candle; they cannot be separated.—Beaumont.

Faith is the root of all good works; a root that produces nothing is dead.—Bishop Wilson.

All the scholastic scaffolding falls, as a ruined edifice, before one single word—faith.—Napoleon.

It is faith in something, and enthusiasm for something, that makes a life worth looking at.—Oliver Wendell Holmes.

There never was found in any age of the world, either philosopher, or sect, or law, or discipline, which did so highly exalt the public good as the Christian faith.—Bacon.

It is faith among men that holds the moral elements together, as it is faith in God that binds the world to His throne.—W. M. Evarts.

Faith and works are as necessary to our spiritual life as Christians, as soul and body are to our life as men; for faith is the soul of religion, and works, the body.—Colton.

We cannot live on probabilities. The faith in which we can live bravely and die in peace must be a certainty, so far as it professes to be a faith at all, or it is nothing.—Froude.

Faith marches at the head of the army of progress. It is found beside the most refined life, the freest government, the profoundest, the noblest poetry, the purest humanity.—T. T. Munger.

Faith is the root of all blessings. Believe, and you shall be saved; believe, and you must needs be satisfied; believe, and you cannot but be comforted and happy.—Jeremy Taylor.

Christian faith is a grand Cathedral, with divinely pictured windows. Standing without, you can see no glory, nor can imagine any, but standing within, every ray of light reveals a harmony of unspeakable splendors. —Hawthorne.

Faith without works is like a bird without wings; though she may hop about on earth, she will never fly to heaven. But when both are joined together, then doth the soul mount up to her eternal rest.—Beaumont.

I prefer a firm religious faith to every other blessing. For it makes life a discipline of goodness; creates new hopes, when those of the world vanish; throws over the decay of life the most gorgeous of all lights; and awakens life even in death.—Sir H. Davy.

This glorious Elizabethan era, with its Shakespeare as the outcome and flowerage of all which had preceded it is itself attributable to the Catholics of the middle ages. The Christian faith which was the theme of Dante's song, had produced the practical life which Shakespeare was to sing.—Carlyle, "Hero and Poet."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES FAVORABLE TO REUNION.

As a foreword let us say that elsewhere we quote a few emphatic pronouncements indicating that the Christian world is disposed to co-operate with our Divine Saviour for unity.

Let us also say that in numerous cities throughout this nation in the past few years, meetings were held in non-Catholic circles to promote Christian unity—trying to creat a basis of union for Christians. The great missionary Congress in Edinburgh in 1910 declared for unity amongst Protestants. But then Bishop Kempthorne reminded them that "a union with the largest communion in the world omitted would be like a map of the world which left out the largest continent." The Triennial Convention of the Anglican Church in Cincinnati in 1910 resolved to work for the reunion of the Churches. Cardinal Gibbons praises the project in a sermon which we print. Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs, New York, who has studied the problem of Church unity for over a quarter of a century, and who tried to unite Presbyterians and Episcopalians, declares that Rome is the goal of unity, and that no one but the Pope can unite the divided followers of Christ. And has not the President of the Wesleyan Reform Union, England, lately declared that it seemed to him that the great agency for the unification of Christendom is the Roman Catholic Church?

Realizing the duties of his exalted office, and that he had the care of all who were to belong to the Fold, did not the Vicar of Christ in late years invite those outside to return to unity? Let us read the weighty words of Leo XIII to those of Greek and other Oriental Rites; as also his solitious encyclical to the English people for the God-like purpose of unity. And the Supreme Pontiff, Pius X, gloriously reigning, has adopted the motto, "to restore all things in Christ." Let unity be restored. Let the wish of Christ be respected, that His followers be one.

To Reunion there is, however, one great obstacle, namely, prejudice—black, blinded prejudice. It is to be hoped that henceforth no one will exercise prejudice in opposition to our Divine Redeemer desiring unity. Why not rather co-operate with that great Christian power—that great central authority, that has proved for eighteen

centuries to be the only power capable of upholding unity and truth?

If the return of one prodigal—one sinner doing penance, causes joy before the angels of God, what must be the reward of those promoting the cause of Reunion of Christendom whereby, not only individuals and families, but whole nations may return to the true faith and thus be cured of their schism and heresy? And why don't the prodigals bring joy to the whole court of heaven by their return? Why don't those sheep that know that they are outside of the Christ-constituted fold, come back? Why would not the lost sheep gaudeate the heart of the Good Shepherd? Why?

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Benson, son of the late Archbp. of Canterbury, while admitting that the conversion of England is difficult, yet reminds us that the arm of the Almighty is not shortened. He says it is an absolute duty for Catholics to strive towards the conversion of England. They are bound, if they are to keep their own faith, to work for the giving of that faith to others.

"Union is strength in religion, as in other things," says Father Benson, "and if Christianity is to prevail it must be united. The only bond that could hold Christians together on the great dogmas of faith is that chosen by the Providence of God—the city of Rome and the Vicar of Christ who dwells therein."

It is to be hoped, then, that this Appeal presented in plain language will be effective. It proceeds from right motives, its cause is right, and the results ought to be satisfactory. A clear presentation of the facts is aimed at, such as the magnitude of an appeal to all classes demands. Such presentation must not give offense to any one, for no offense is intended. If those, to whom the Divine Master entrusted the task of announcing to the world the Gospel, were not plain, outspoken men, what confusion would arise from their mission? We love them for their candor and sincerity. If any sentence in the following is so outspoken as to sound harsh, let the righteousness of the cause be our excuse. "Am I then become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. 4:16.) For non-Catholics we have love and respect, but for wrong systems of religion we have only words of condemnation. We pity the prodigals while denouncing prodigality. We love Protestants while we know Pro-

testantism must be necessarily wrong. It has demonstrated to the world by its conflicting theories that it is wrong.

"Be sure you are right and then go ahead." The Church was started right. Her Founder has kept her right, and she is, consequently, right today. To the Apostles, soon to die for Him, did He promise in their corporate capacity "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." (John 28:20.) Nay more. The Spirit of truth is dwelling with the Church since the Pentecostal day. "I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever." (John 14:16.) "It is expedient to you that I go; for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you. . . . But when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth." (John 16:7, 13.) Americans see here an absolute guarantee that His Kingdom—the Church—will not fall into error. When, therefore, any sect or organization starts on the erroneous, or unchristian principle that the Church—the Church recognized in England in A. D. 1492, as the Gospel Church—the Catholic Church, erred in matters of faith, such a sect or organization, we care not by what name it is designated, stands self-condemned and utterly unjustifiable in the eyes of all Christians.

The Church being the embodiment of God's word, opposition to her, upheld by His Almighty hand, is colossal blunder. Violation of the physical laws is disastrous; violation of the laws of hygiene brings injury to health; violation of the laws of the realm entails penalties. So also in the Kingdom, which Our Saviour established, He requires unity. In the government of His Mystical Body He requires uniformity so that the hand will not be continually striking the head. Violation of the laws, established for the observance of this uniformity, inflicts spiritual ruin on offending members. Opposition to Christ's plan of teaching the world appears today a miserable failure in the multiplicity of spurious Christian faiths, that prevail to the consequent ruin of innumerable souls. Americans are thoroughly disgusted at the efforts of any sect calling itself Christian and yet attacking the Christ-arranged Chief Pastorate, and allying to itself all the vile resources of infidelity to accomplish its sinister purpose. No, the Church, and its Chief Pastor, the Vicar of

Christ, may be annoyed and harassed, but conquered never. The Redeemer died that the Church might live for all time for the benefit of humanity.

Atonement was made on this earth by the Man-God. Arrangements were made by Him who made this Atonement to have men in this 20th century share in the fruits of redemption; and these means are the Church and the Sacraments. Men were to be taught about the facts of redemption by those lawfully sent to have people "observe what He commanded." "And better for Sodom and Gommorrah in the day of judgment than for those repudiating these authorized teachers." So He said. As Chief Administrator, as Chief Pastor for Christ's sheep to be fed, He appointed Peter. And if St. John, the Evangelist, never told us of the Chief Pastorate thus established, it is obvious that the Church would have enjoyed the wonderful authority all the same. When, therefore, a usurper noisily makes use of his visibility to dethrone the visible Church and proclaim her merely invisible on earth, Americans smile and hold on to the arrangements and promises of Christ.

No one ought to find fault with being told his mistake. People generally like the right and the true. Why should anyone, except the criminally bent, prefer the wrong? We are thankful to those who put us aright or help us in business, or elevate us in the social scale, why not appreciate those who would help us in the most important affair that can engross the thought, or captivate the heart of man? Speaking the truth, then, should need no apology.

The Appeal is addressed to people too cultured to be infidels. We respect the goodness of those who are bona fide. They have been mistaken or deceived. Printing, invented just on the eve of the Reformation, has been employed in the ugly work of defaming the Church. The history of the past three centuries is a conspiracy against the Church and truth. People have been imbibing from poisonous intellectual fountains—the non-Catholic pulpit, the College, and the Press.

It is time, however, for Susanna wrongfully accused, to be vindicated. "Return to judgment, for they have borne false witness against her." (Dan. 13:49.) As the chaste Susanna was condemned to death through the false testimony of wicked men, so is the Church—the spouse

of Christ—sometimes unjustly condemned. Therefore she demands an investigation, she claims a re-hearing. And according to Macaulay, "There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human(?) policy so well deserving of examination as the Catholic Church." Well also has Father Nampon, S. J., said, "The Catholic Church is the only kingdom which has Jesus Christ for a sovereign; the only family of which He is the Father; the only fold which He directs as shepherd; the only body of which He is the head." Of this Kingdom the Sovereign has given the keys to His vicegerent. Over that flock has the Good Shepherd placed a Chief Pastorate. It is to call the attention of Schismatics and Protestants to the belief of their Christian ancestors that this Appeal is written, reminding our readers that we, in America, consider that calling the Church—the Spouse of Christ, vile names, and slandering His vicegerent is a disgrace to everyone bearing the dignified name of Christian.

The Far East is awakening. Read elsewhere the testimony of the Japanese savant, Dr. Masaha, relative to the Church, "that the Catholic religion is the one to be recommended to the Japanese." Read the testimony declaring that the task of Christianizing China can be accomplished only by the Catholic Church. General Booth says the same regarding the evangelization of India.

And while Christians remain sulking and jealous in their various camps, Mahometism, Paganism, and Infidelity are on the increase. What Christian, knowing who Christ is, what person professing Christian faith, what one with enduring hope in His never-failing promises, or who with a spark of the love of the Redeemer in his bosom, would fail to be enthused in His cause in view of such unchristian, successful depravity, and perfidy? Why don't Christians arise and be united as they ought, and the Lord of Hosts, "who for us men and for our salvation descended from heaven," will surely bless our united Christian endeavor. "This is what overcometh the world, our Faith." Let all Christians, therefore, work and above all pray, that this year may be signalized by the progress of this oneness in faith.

"Glory and honor and peace to every one that worketh good." (Rom. 2:10.)

A CATHOLIC POEM BY A PROTESTANT.

"The Blessed Mary's Land."

This is indeed the blessed Mary's land,
Virgin and Mother of our dear Redeemer!
All hearts are touched and softened at her name:
Alike the bandit with the bloody hand,
The priest, the prince, the scholar, and the peasant,
The man of deeds, the visionary dreamer,
Pay homage to her as one ever present!
And even as children who have much offended
A too-indulgent father, in great shame,
Penitent, and yet not daring unattended
To go into his presence, at the gate,
Speak to their sister, and confiding wait
Till she goes in before and intercedes:
So men, repenting of their evil deeds,
And yet not venturing rashly to draw near,
With their requests, an angry Father's ear,
Offer to her prayers and their confession,
And she in heaven for them makes intercession,
And if our faith had given us nothing more
Than this example of all womanhood,
So mild, so merciful, so strong, so good,
So patient, peaceful, loyal, loving, pure,
This were enough to prove it higher and truer
Than all the creeds the world had known before."

—H. W. Longfellow.

Columbia has the Mother Immaculate as Patroness, and Britannia was formerly so devoted to the Mother of Jesus, that it was styled "Our Lady's Dowry." Would that the various Christians in both these lands would now unite, and in the language of Sacred Writ, call her "Blessed."

England of old so revering the favored and sinless one, "Our tainted nature's solitary boast," has sinned against the light. The land of Mary's glorious shrines has been characterized for the past three centuries for its unworthy repudiation of the Immaculate. After the three days' separation, is it not time that the reunited love of Jesus and Mary find a place in the Anglican heart?

"And even as children who have much offended
A too-indulgent father in great shame,
Penitent, and yet not daring unattended
To go into his presence, and confiding wait
Till she goes in before and intercedes;"

so let Anglicans, reading a-right history's page, and learning about their country's cruel policy and black perfidy toward the admirers of Mary, and Jesus Whom she gave to the world, now fervently ask her

"So mild, so merciful, so strong, so good,
So patient, peaceful, loyal, loving, pure,"

to intercede with the Mediator that He once more give England the faith. And thus have Anglicans realize what Dryden wrote:

"One in herself, not rent by schism, but sound,
Entire, one solid, shining diamond;
Not, like sparkles, shattered into sects like you,
One is the Church, and must be to be true;
One central principle of unity,
As undivided, so from error free;
As one in faith, so one in sanctity."

We earnestly request all interested in the true faith across the Atlantic, as also the Clergy, Religious, and Catholic Societies here, to co-operate with us in calling urgent attention, in this progressive century, to our dear Saviour's farewell prayer. What deed more knightly than this? And, therefore, we would fain ask the Knights of St. John and all other Christian Knights and especially the Knights of Columbus to promote the cause of reunion as laid down in these pages.

What nobler, what more chivalrous, than that those who are associated in Christian Knighthood—those who have put on the "armour of God"—those arrayed in the celestial panoply described by St. Paul—should fight for the cause of God against infidelity and agnosticism?

What cause more sublime for valiant Christian Knights than to promote the spiritual welfare of humanity, to advance the brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God, to encourage religion, and to foster piety, to defend their fair Lady's honor, and to carry out the Saviour's dying wish for the people He came to redeem? None. then let the cause speed mightily. **God wills it.**

(Rev.) JOHN PHELAN.

Grand Junction, Iowa.
Feast of St. Gregory the Great, 1912.

Appeal for Unity in the Faith

CHAPTER I.

GROUNDS OF APPEAL

"Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We also are."—St. John 17:11.

"And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who though their word shall believe in Me:

That they all may be one."—St. John 17:20-21.

It is obviously the duty of human beings of every nation, class and condition, who believe in Christ as their Redeemer and Teacher, to accept in its entirety His heavenly doctrine. It is also the duty of all calling themselves His followers to strive to their utmost to carry out His loving wish, and to co-operate in the fulfillment of His fervent prayer.

Every Christian reading the Saviour's appeal to His Father on the night before His bitter passion and tragic death, when He was making His farewell discourse to His disciples, must be impressed with His ardent words of love, and feel stimulated to carry out His farewell wish.

Persons living in these States, united happily under a common head, observe the steady march of the nation onward to greatness and prosperity. They look back with horror on those four years when North and South were engaged in fratricidal strife. The same persons view with dismay the

internal strife that has existed for well nigh four hundred years in the spiritual Kingdom which the Master established while on earth, and long for the day when peace may be re-established, and the spiritual Kingdom advance to further greatness and prosperity.

Everyone knows that the unity of the Kingdom was broken in the English-speaking world over three centuries ago, and that the disunion is kept up in our day. It ought to be time that this miserable, unchristian, ungodly contention would cease. And as this dissension largely originated in England we naturally look to Englishmen—Christian Englishmen—to be chivalrous enough to *repair the breach, and to do their utmost to effect a reunion.*

The people of this twentieth century care little for the domestic broils of England in the sixteenth century. They want the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus. Nowhere do they need it more, or prize it higher, than in the land of George Washington; but they are handicapped by a political system of religion spread through the influence of England.

Americans are inheritors of what is best in England's jurisprudence, but they are inheritors also of England's dissensions in religion; and as these dissensions are destructive of the unity which is an essential characteristic of the Christian faith, and as our civilization is based on Christianity, and as America considers that Christianity and its civilization ought to go hand in hand, and ought to prevail here; it is evident that these dis-

sensions ought to be settled and Christianity be thus strengthened. Moreover, the Christian faith demands that the obstacles to its extension amongst pagans be removed.

We say we have the best and freest government on earth; that we are the most prosperous and progressive of nations; that we have the best in material things; so, also, as a nation, ought we not have the best in spiritual matters? If schism, heresy, and divorce be evils; and if these largely originated in England; and if America be today the victim of these evils; America has consequently a right to look to England to help to rectify these disorders. The Gospel Church teaches that schism, heresy and divorce are great evils; and we see that Scripture corroborates her teaching. If, then, England has added to the sin of the world by these classes of evil—violating the unity of faith, thus causing schism and subsequent heresy—it is clear that she owes to *her God, to the world at large, to her own subjects in particular,* and *to the United States, her former colonial possession, a debt she ought to pay;* by doing *her best* to restore the unity of the faith amongst English-speaking people.

Americans regretfully review the spiritual miseries brought on the English-speaking world during the past four hundred years. So great a victory has Satan gained, so strongly has he urged men to oppose the wish and prayer of the Master

for unity, that Christianity is divided into numerous sects at variance with one another, and especially at variance with the Apostolic See of Peter. Not only is this nation divided on the one faith, but the family also, in many cases, is found to include various creeds. With unity of faith broken, persons are headed toward dark infidelity, while divorce is making such havoc that about a million cases have been recorded in this country in the past twenty years. And right here let it be said to the great praise of the English people, that although the King's Church started along with the King's divorce, yet divorce has not been allowed to spread its infection as freely in England and Canada, as in this country. England ought to work for Reunion with the Holy See and thus have her schism healed, and become rectified on lines of faith. Reunion, then, ought to be effected where the union was broken. Americans rejoice in their political reunion, so indeed they would also rejoice in their spiritual unification.

It is generally known, too, that these dissensions were not caused by difference of doctrine, as much as by personal differences between the sovereigns of England and the heads of the Church. And as these rulers have long since passed away, the previous normal conditions ought to prevail. Henry divorced his wife, and at the same time divorced his realm from the Holy See. He took unto himself another wife, whose daughter got recognition as England's queen, in spite of the Holy See.

Though Henry and Elizabeth are dead for over three hundred years, yet the troubles and dissensions in the Christian fold, which they unhappily caused, remain.

No fair-minded Englishman will deny that such dissensions are an *outrage, not only on Christ,* but also on *all His distracted followers;* for who can lead a godly life, or be pleasing to the Saviour, while opposing His dying wish and prayer?

Would that England now return to the Gospel Church—to her Divine faith of yore—to the faith of Edward, the Confessor! And also Scotland to that of her saintly Margaret, and Wales to the belief of her holy Patron David! Three other countries over which saintly kings once ruled, namely, Norway, St. Olave; Sweden, St. Eric; Denmark, St. Canute; are now steeped in schism and heresy. What's to hinder people from those countries, who have settled in free America—the land of "e pluribus unum"—returning now to the faith of their forefathers—returning to the faith once delivered to the saints—to the faith these saints professed? What?

The face of this old earth would be renewed if men generally would feel towards their God like the noble St. Francis Xavier, Apostle of the Indies, saying: "O God! I love Thee not for the sake of winning heaven, or of escaping hell, not for the hope of gaining anything but solely because Thou art my God."

"May God give unto you the Spirit of wisdom, and of revelation in the knowledge of Him: The eyes of your heart enlightened, that you may know what the hope is of His calling, and what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the Saints. And what is the exceeding greatness of His power toward us, who believe according to the operation of the might of His power."—Eph. 1:17-19.

CHAPTER II.

THE BASIS OF REUNION.

"The Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."—I Tim. 3:15.

What is to be the basis of reunion? The Thirty-nine Articles? The Thirty-nine Articles, according to Anglicans themselves, are in *need of revision,* are *rejected by many of their own church,* are *anathematized,* in part, by the Roman Church; are regarded as *erroneous* by the Greek church; and are *not acceptable to dissenting Christians.* Hence the Articles cannot be the generally acceptable basis of Reunion. A Reunion, to be a genuine Christian Reunion, must be based on "the faith once delivered to the saints." Reunion to be lasting and lawful must be on right principles. There must be no compromise with truth. Hence Reunion on the basis that two and two are five would be unworthy of all who would participate in it.

Better pass over the distracted period of the formulation of the Thirty-nine Articles and fix on some date when the English nation clearly and generally accepted "the faith once delivered to the saints." Let A. D. 1492, the discovery of America by Columbus, be that date. It is a date well known amongst the nations, and will be accept-

able to Englishmen, being, as they are, sailors, and merchants, and progressive people; loving enterprise and greatness of courage: and Englishmen hold Columbus in veneration because he was a man of strong religious sentiment. Now what was the faith of England then? Evidently Catholic, Roman Catholic. *Unity of faith* generally prevailed throughout "Merrie England" in those days, as the *result of obedience to the Holy Father,* successor of St. Peter. And if unity of faith is to again pervade England, *obedience* to the Vicar of Christ *must be restored.*

It is very clear from the Gospels, that the Jews, at the time of our Lord, were ardently wishing for the coming of the King of Israel—the Messias. And it is true today that the Christian sects are longing for unity. Is this an indication that the day of the realization of "the one fold under the One Shepherd" is nigh?

To Englishmen let us earnestly apply these words of St. Paul:—"O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth crucified among you?"—Gal. 3:1

"The true union between Christians is that which Jesus Christ, the author of the Church constituted and desired, and which consists in a unity of faith and a unity of government." Ency. Leo XIII on "Reunion of Christendom." June 20, 1894.

CHAPTER III.

IF WE GO BACK ONE THOUSAND YEARS FURTHER.

"Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matt. 28:20.

But some may say, let us go back one thousand years earlier, or to A. D. 500, as England believes in the four General Councils completed then. Well, if we do, we will find the successor of St. Peter, commonly called the Bishop of Rome, the moving or controlling force of these Councils. We will find his Primacy indelibly recorded in those Councils. We will find facts and data sufficient to condemn the rebellion against spiritual authority that characterizes the Anglican schism. And if Englishmen be true and loyal to their convictions as based on those Councils, *they must acknowledge that Primacy,* and not one more line of this Appeal need be penned.

And although an appeal to the first four Councils would thus settle the matter under consideration, yet we do not care to fix on that date as a basis for Reunion, because we are appealing to *Christian* England, and in A. D. 500 England was rather pagan than Christian. And still we find, that whatever bishops were in Britain at that early day, acknowledged the supremacy of the Vicar of

Christ, as is evidenced by their accepting the decrees of Arles and Sardica and the four General Councils; thus clearly showing that they were in communion with Christendom in acknowledging the Chief Pastorate conferred on Peter by the Divine Master.

It is a matter of surprise that an Anglo-Saxon writer of the Homilies would use that strange expression, that *vile* and *utterly untrue statement*—that "England was for eight hundred years previous to the Reformation steeped in abominable idolatry"; and invite us back to the time when *his ancestors worshipped the oak* with the Druids. Anglicans, as at present constituted, can never go back to the early Church to find their prototype; for a state church, with the king as its spiritual head, with two sacraments and a garbled version of their previous doctrine, separated from Rome, and every other Apostolic See, and still regarded as part of Christendom, appears not in early ecclesiastical history and is no better than a *myth*.

"We are happy, O Israel: because the things that are pleasing to God are made known to us."—Bar. 4:4.

To those inclined to criticise because we select the national faith of England, A. D., 1492, or thereabouts as being very definite, let us quote the words of J. R. Stone: "Let us go back to the beginning of the 16th century. Either there was a Church of God then in the world, or there was not. If there was not, then the reformers certainly could not create such a Church. If there was, they as certainly had neither the right to abandon it, nor the power to remodel it."

CHAPTER IV.

UNITY IN FAITH NECESSARY NOW AS FORMERLY.

"I was under a necessity to write unto you: to beseech you to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints."—Jude 1:3.

Return to Gospel truth is necessary. Englishmen ought to realize that there is but one faith. St. Paul insists upon unity in faith in the following emphatic language: "Be careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." (Eph. 4:5-6.)

Cardinal Gibbons in "The Faith of Our Fathers," commenting, says: "As you all worship one God, and not many Gods; as you acknowledge the same divine Mediator of Redemption, and not many mediators; as you are sanctified by the same Divine Spirit, and not by many spirits; as you all hope for the same heaven, and not different heavens, so must you all profess the same faith."

That the three hundred millions of Catholics, different in every other respect, should have the one and the same faith is *truly wonderful.* And this wonder could have been effected only on God's plan. And because *England interfered with this*

plan, the English speaking world is today in a deplorable condition in matters of faith. Christians are in confusion: pagans unconverted. In that admirable prayer for His disciples, just before His Passion, our Saviour, with eyes uplifted to heaven, addressed his Father, "And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as We also are one." (St. John 17:20-22.)

Men of strict principles ought to know that human opinion must not conflict with the certitude of divine faith.

Lawyers tell us that the essence of an agreement consists in the *union of the minds of the contracting parties* on the matters proposed. Hence if there be divergence or disagreement on any one important point the essential condition is not present. "Agreement and union of minds, consequently," says Leo XIII., in his Ency. on Unity of the Church, "is the necessary foundation of this perfect concord amongst men, from which concurrence of wills and similarity of action are the natural result." Hence the *complete agreement* that must exist amongst the members in matters of faith so that they may be with one another and with Christ. In this way we realize the necessity of receiving the complete truth given by Christ as

He received it from the Father. Hence the necessity of knowing precisely what Christ taught and its meaning. Hence it is evident that *guesses of private interpretation, or diversity of sects, can have no place in the divine unity of faith.* Hence, too, it is manifest that there *can be no such thing as non-conformity* in Christ's *economy of unity.* Hence, then, the necessity of His great agency to declare to the world with a *certainty* the truths of faith and their meaning. We can thus see at a glance the necessity of the Church which St. Paul calls the "pillar and ground of truth" and "the living Church of the living God."

Men are not grateful enough to God for His mercies toward them. And in no way do men more manifest their ingratitude than by sneering at the Church—the guardian of heavenly truth—the safe, infallible guide He has provided for their salvation.

Truth comes from God and ought to be respected by His creatures. The observance of truth fosters harmony. There is harmony among the angels in heaven, and there ought to be harmony amongst men in matters appertaining to heaven, especially as men were created to occupy a place in heaven vacated by the discordant angels. When harmony was broken by the heavenly denizens we know of their eternal anathema. Hence wise people ought to beware of diversity with God—established unity in His Kingdom here below.

CHAPTER V.

TRUTH CANNOT CONTRADICT ITSELF.

"I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth."—St. John 14:16, 17.

When will men see that truth cannot contradict itself, and that this is especially so regarding revealed truth? If the Bible is the written word of God and the Church is the depositary—the receptacle—the embodiment of the word of God; nay, the mystical embodiment of Christ Himself; such an embodiment that she voices, repeats the very words of Christ as hers; and that she is guaranteed to teach correctly this word of God, this revealed truth, how can the oral conflict with the written word? Especially as the Church knows *all* truth from Christ and the Paraclete—the Spirit of Truth. (St. John 14:26; 16:13.) It is generally admitted that there was no conflict in the first century. If, as some assert, who find fault of late years, that there could be no conflict between the Church and the Bible in the first century, there can be no conflict in the twentieth century, for Christ's guarantee remains. Impossible that a conflict will take place till the end of time, for the Church is the spouse of Christ—His mystical body, in which the Holy Spirit dwells. We see there was no conflict in the past nineteen centuries, and this is a

pretty good indication that there will be harmony till the end of time.

The party that attacked the Church, now, alas! attacks the Scriptures. It must never be forgotten that whatever texts refer to the Church in the New Testament are evidently intended for the Gospel Church—the one identified with St. Peter and with his successsors, and *not* for any other. By no possibility can they refer to a church non-existent today, but which may yet be established in this twentieth century. And yet do we not see that such unlawful quoting characterized every church rebel from Simon Magus of Samaria (A. D. 33) to John Alexander Dowie of Chicago (1908). It must never be forgotten, too, that of all infatuations, there is none greater than trying to found a new Christian Church with the Bible in opposition to the one already founded by Christ. This is a complete reversal of Christ's system as manifested in the Church herself, and on the sacred page. Sacred Scripture was *not* written to encourage disobedience or antagonism to God or His work.

The Church can say to *her* enemies as her Founder said to His, "Search the Scriptures, they give testimony of me." (St. John 5:39.) They tell of the necessity of faith and its unity. See how the Fathers defend this unity against schismatics and heretics. Read the acts of the first four councils, and of subsequent ones, maintaining this unity. We see, then, that Faith is necessary to salvation, for "without it, it is impossible to

please God," and there is but *one faith.* It is as essential to salvation as a foundation is to a house. How, therefore, can the knowledge of these truths of faith, with which it is possible to please God, be *surely* acquired, and how can it be arranged so that all humanity can possess this faith in unison? Only through God's plan. What, then, is God's plan? His plan was evidently in working order on the first Pentecostal Day. God's plan is manifestly the Church teaching what Christ had taught her—the Church teaching the world "to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded". (St. Matt. 28:20.)

"He that believes not shall be condemned." (St. Mark 16:16.) If all are to believe under penalty of damnation, we see, then, how they can know what they are to believe. The English Government for the past three centuries hindered people from knowing what they are to believe by exercising its influence against the Holy See, the headquarters of that Church that received her doctrine from Him who is "the Way, the Truth and the Life." St. John tells the world, "He that knoweth God heareth us. He that is not of God heareth us not," (I John 4:6) and he gives this as a characteristic sign of truth and error. "By this we know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." (Ibid.) By this system only can men "be of one mind." (Phil. 2:2.) "By faith, then, and love are we united to God and Christ," says Cornelius á Lapide, "and afterwards mutually to each other as to members of Christ's mystical body —the Church."

"Christ had prayed that those who believe in Him should be one; and *that unity* which He so much desired is found in obedience to the Holy See." So said Pius X to the English pilgrims at his golden jubilee in 1908. If Christian unity can be found in this obedience, why should not every Englishman render this obedience and work for unity, since it is not only the Savior's prayer, but also the prayer of Anglicans themselves, in praying to be delivered "from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism." And at the end of the Anglican litany there is a prayer of St. John Chrysostom, strangely reminding them of unity or "one accord", as they ask for the knowledge of God's saving truth. And as it is most expedient for Anglicans, for those Christians who are scandalized, as well as for Pagans whose conversion is delayed, that Anglicans themselves fully realize that they *are* in schism, these lines are penned so that they may the more readily get their prayer for the knowledge of this saving truth. Read what Chrysostom says, and for Heaven's sake attend to it. "We know that salvation belongs to the Church alone, and that no one can partake of Christ, *nor can he be saved,* out of the Catholic Church and faith." (Hom. 1, in Pasc.)

Moreover, Christ prayed that Christians may be one so that the world may believe that the Father hath sent Him. Unity amongst His followers is to be the *sign* to the world of the Savior's divine mission; and if Protestants be genuine Christians they should be ready to give this sign, by reunion

with that Church which is especially characterized by unity. As unity is, then, the most luminous evidence of Christ's mission, will Anglicans give this evidence, even at this late hour and thus promote the conversion of India, China and Japan? And as the Catholic faith, or as some would call it, the Roman Catholic faith, is the birthright of every Anglo-Saxon, and as it was good enough for Anglo-Saxons, it ought to be good enough for Orientals, since better is not given by God to man.

Would Anglicans give their moral and practical encouragement if the same lawful authority that sent Augustine to Britain should now send another such to India? If so, reunion with that same lawful authority, the Apostolic See of Peter, ought to be immediately effected. And as it was a disobedient Augustinian monk that, in an evil hour, brought religious dissensions into the world, let us see what does St. Augustin himself say: "We must hold fast to the Christian religion and to the communion of that Church which is Catholic and is called Catholic, not only by her own children, but even by all her enemies." (Lib. de Unit. Eccl., Cap. VII., No. 12.)

"Everyone therefore that shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him before My Father who is in heaven.

"But he that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father who is in heaven."—St. Matt. 10:32-33.

"As the Father sent Me, I send you" says Christ.

"And how shall they preach unless they be sent? asks St. Paul.

CHAPTER VI.

DIVERSITY OF FAITH AND CREED WRONG.

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism."—Eph. 4:5.

Unity in faith and communion and religious government characterizes the true followers of Christ. As unity of faith is needed, so is unity of creed which is a formulation of the articles of faith. This wonderful economy of unity is what England violated to the great detriment of the English speaking world. There is, today, no religious unity in England, except amongst those professing the ancient religion represented in old Catholic families such as that of the Vaughans.

The National Church is divided into High, Low and Broad. There are dissenters or nonconformists. Protestant bishop differs from Protestant bishop, preacher from preacher, and the people may interpret the Scriptures as they please, even though this interpretation be the greatest nonsense. This destruction of unity people strangely claim to be their boast and privilege. "The fierceness of the attacks upon Christianity, the divisions prevalent amongst Christian bodies separated from Rome, the inroads of free thought amongst the individuals of whom they are composed," are reasons, according to Most Rev. Dr. Ryle, Prot.

Bishop of Liverpool, which call for reunion. The conversion of two pagan continents and the countless isles of the sea, makes it imperative that the allegiance to the Apostolic See be maintained, so that Christian unity be preserved, upheld and extended.

When the unity of the faith was broken in the sixteenth century and appeal made to the Scriptures, was a new unity of faith the result? Certainly not. The leaders contradicted each other: Luther, Zwinglius, Calvin, etc., quarreled and used very disedifying language towards one another. For 300 years or more their followers are divided, and if it were possible to have them reunited tomorrow, how can they be of God, unless reunited to that Church that retained Apostolic unity? Collectively, Protestants of various kinds in England are not of God, for they have not the unity of faith. Neither has any one sect this essential mark of Christianity, because by individual interpretation they cannot "be of one mind". (Phil. 2:2.) "And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul." (Acts 4:32.) In unity the head prevents the hand striking at the heart, the head preserves uniformity amongst the members.

It is a libel on Jesus Christ to assert that His Christianity consists of hundreds of warring sects; and eternal woe must befall those who have divided Christendom, and are further dividing it, and thus opposing His prayer for unity. As well divide up England, this twentieth century, into

the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, as divide the Christian Empire into national churches, or sects.

Persons on their knees to God, reciting the Apostles', the Nicene, or Athanasian Creeds, do not say they believe in national churches, or churches of any sect; but they declare they believe in the Catholic Church.

"I cease not to give thanks for you, making commemoration of you in my prayers, ... that you may know what is the exceeding greatness of His power towards us who believe."—Eph. 1:16-19.

"Every plant which thy Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."—St. Matt. 15:13.

The Royal Prophet alluding to the majesty, power, and holiness of Christ's Kingdom, the Church, says: "Thy testimonies are very sure: holiness becometh thine house, O Lord, forever."—Ps. 93:5. (King James Ver.)

A PRAYER FOR THE CONVERSION OF UNBELIEVERS.

O Holy Spirit of Truth, we beseech Thee to enlighten the minds of unbelievers in the midst of us, to incline their hearts to Thy word, and to believe the teaching of Thy Church; give them courage to accept the faith and openly profess it; that they may come into union with Thee and the Father, through Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth forever and ever. Amen.

Our Father, etc. Hail Mary, etc. Glory be to the Father, etc.

By a Rescript dated May 4, 1894, the Holy Father, Leo XIII, has granted 100 days indulgence each day, to those who devoutly and contritely recite the above prayer.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LIVING CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD.

"The Church which is His body."—Eph. 1:22-23.

Let these facts be granted:

That Christ established a Church.

That He demanded obedience to this Church from all who wished to be saved. "He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen."

That this Church, the depositary of Christ's teachings, existed before the New Testament was written.

That the Church of Christ is the one established by Him, and completed at Pentecost.

That the Church of Christ—the Gospel Church—is surely the one connected with Peter, founded on Peter.

That Christ conferred the supreme pastoral care of His faithful in a special manner on Peter.

That this Church bears testimony that Peter and his successors have exercised this supreme pastoral care adown the ages.

That this Church received authority, or the right and power to teach and govern the faithful, from Him Who has all power in heaven and on earth.

That this Church is perpetual—enjoying the

Saviour's promises and co-operation; and the indwelling of the Paraclete.

That this Church, therefore, enjoys today the full assurance that "hell's gates shall not prevail against it;" and that Christ is with the Church teaching.

That this Church continues to possess the Spirit of Truth that was to remain with it forever.

That this Church has thus inherited all the promises given to it of infallibility and indefectibility.

That this Church is known in history as the Catholic Church.

That the seat of government of this Church has been located in Rome.

That the Primitive Church, and the Papacy or headship of that Church, has a regular continuation down to our day.

That this Church held general councils adown the ages—twenty in nineteen centuries.

That this Church is not a mere organization—it is more. It is a living organism, and has the principle of life inherent in itself.

That heresy and schism, as so adjudged by this Church, thus established by Christ, are deadly sins; for it is a teaching Church. "He that hears you, hears Me;" "Going therefore, teach ye all nations;" "He that despises you, despises Me."

That this Church founded by Christ, the custodian of His teachings, the inheritor of His promises, the dispenser of His mysteries, the authorized teacher of all nations, and protected against error—this first Church existing since the day of Christ—must be true, as it is a Divine verity.

That this Church has thus been authorized to teach the faith to the English nation.

And that England acknowledged such authority in A. D. 1492.

From these facts follow these deductions:

It is not correct to believe that there are *several* Christian churches, for there is *only one* Christian Church.

It is not correct to establish a new method of teaching Christian truth at variance with Christ's system, as He established a Church to teach people what to observe.

It is not correct to say that any sect, separated from Christ's Church ruled over by Peter and his successors, is, nevertheless, belonging to this true Christian Church.

It is not correct to say that rebellious sects are perpetual, or are promised immunity against error, or are lawful dispensers of God's mysteries,—lawful administrators of those channels of grace called Sacraments.

It is not correct to believe that any mere rebel has authority to take the keys from the Key-bearer.

It is not correct to say that any sect that sprung up since Apostolic days, especially during the last three or four centuries, is, or can possibly be, the historic or Apostolic Church.

* * *

Furthermore, let these additional Scriptural references to the Church be admitted:

The Church is to have a common faith and wor-

ship, a feature represented under the striking image of the concourse of all peoples and nations to worship at Jerusalem. (Mich. 4:1,2; Is.2:2.) (Vide *Cath. Ency.*, Vol. III, p. 745.)

It is to be universal, extending over all nations, (Ps.21:28 seq.), absorbing all kingdoms (Dan. 2:44).

It is to be a kingdom ruled by a man in the absence of the Founder (Matt. 18:18; John 21:17).

* * * *

We find the Messianic prophecies relating to the Church of the Messias fulfilled; we find the Messias Himself promising to establish His Church on Peter; we find His Church exercising its ministry in the days of the Apostles as recorded in the Acts; and we find that ever since, the world's history has been a record of its usefulness to mankind.

The Church is the kingdom which God has raised up, which will last forever. (Dan. 2:44.)

It is likened unto the city seated on a mountain that cannot be hidden. (St. Matt. 5:14.)

It is the fold presided over by one shepherd into which all the sheep must come. (St. John 10:16.)

It is the mystic Body of Christ, and He is the Head of all the Church. (Eph. 1:22-23.)

It is the perpetual corporation beginning with the Apostles, and lasting till the consummation of the world. (St. Matt. 28:20.)

It is the saving institution. (Acts 2:14.)

In the words of Bellarmine, the Church is defined to be "A body of men united together by the profession of the same Christian Faith, and by the participation in the same sacraments, under the governance of lawful pastors, more especially of the Roman Pontiff, the sole Vicar of Christ on earth."

The end in view in establishing the Church was spiritual, namely, to promote the salvation of souls, which cannot be attained but by supernatural means, or by the sacraments. The first Church—the Catholic Church—was empowered to administer these "channels of grace," as she was authorized to preach the gospel. *No one else was.* Hence no modern church, separated from, or independent of, the Gospel Church can lawfully administer the sacraments. Usurpation in civil affairs is not allowed in England. Why should it be allowed in spiritual?

In the domain of the spiritual—in the Kingdom of God, the King of Kings has, then, given authority to administer the sacraments and to teach the world to "observe what He had commanded"; and it is by attending to this teaching body that we have faith. For "faith, then, cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:17), "and how shall they hear without a preacher" (Rom. 10:14); "and how shall they preach unless they be sent?" (Rom. 10:15.) "Going therefore, teach ye all nations." (St. Matt. 28:19.)

Teachers, themselves, must have the faith, and must have authority or commission to teach it.

But what are we to say relative to those who have *not* the correct faith; and, of course, have no *authority* to teach that defective faith? And also what is to be said about those receiving such wrong faith?

The *Ecclesia docens*—the Church teaching the doctrine which the Master taught her, is the *embodiment of God's word*. It was His word or command that made the Apostles His followers. They listened to His word during the three years of His public mission. They imbibed His doctrine. Replete with His maxims, they go forth to teach the nations. Rejection of the Church, therefore, is rejection of God's word, for as we have seen it was His word that gave her existence and action. How foolish, therefore, the tactics of those who reject the Gospel Church and her teaching, and try to guide themselves by the Scriptures. They take up the Bible, but it warns them "to hear the Church". And He says to His representatives, "He that hears you hears Me". "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: going forth out of that house or city, shake off the dust from your feet. Amen, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment than for that city." (Matt. 10:14, 15.) This, then, is a dreadful thought, the sin of unbelief is more grievous and more deserving of damnation than the abominations of the Cities of the Plain.

And if the Church of the Gospel explained to the world at Nice about the baptism of heretics,

that Christ was consubstantial with the Father and other matters; and at Ephesus that Mary was the Mother of the Man-God in the hypostatic or personal union; why had not the Church authority in 1854 to proclaim Mary's Immaculate Conception: that she, who gave flesh and blood to the Incarnate God, was herself pure and sinless, through the merits of that same Divine Son? And has not the Church the same divine authority today? All these matters, requiring explanation, were defined as necessity demanded. And the representatives of that same Gospel Church coming to us in this twentieth century explaining the faith, if we receive them not, it were better for the Cities of the Plain than for us.

We are addressing persons we regard as Christians; and as such are aware of our Divine Saviour's promise to be with His teaching body till the end of the world. We believe we are addressing persons that believe in our Divine Saviour's veracity, and His Omnipotence to carry His word into effect. We believe, too, that it is well known that He gave a double assurance of heavenly cooperation with the Church, when He asked the Father to send another Paraclete—the Spirit of Truth, Who would remind the authorized teaching body—the Church, of whatsoever He said to them; and Who would teach them all things, and abide with them forever. It would seem that He gave this double assurance of assistance lest there might be anyone who would doubt that the Church was competent to teach what He commanded. But be it said to man's—ignorant, ungrateful man's—

everlasting disgrace, that he doubted, denied his Divine Redeemer's promises; and hence we have, today, creeds formulated on mere human opinions.

Protestants must not regard the Church as a mere telegraphic messenger, but one empowered to interpret the message: in a word, an authorized teacher. And all she condemned, adown the ages, for their own errors or for their refusal to accept her official pronouncements, were cast out and declared accursed.

It was reading the Monophysite heresy and the firm attitude of the Church towards it, and the fact that *he* was in the same position towards that same Gospel Church, as the Monophysites and Eutychians, that gave such a shock to Newman in 1839, then an Anglican. And this same Church—the bishops in communion with their head—that condemned the Gnostics, Donatists, Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Precillians, *et id genus omne,* condemns the Modernists today. Christians must be thankful to God that it was not the Anglican Church that was engaged adown the ages in these dreadful contests; especially when we witness this very day that she cannot defend the dogmas handed down and bearing the impress of over 1000 years of Christian observance. Americans, seeing this, consider that Anglicans should *soften their criticism.* And yet be their criticism the most rigorous, the Church comes out victorious. After these dreadful conflicts in the first seven centuries from foes without and still more treacherous foes within, Pope St. Agatho (A. D. 680) could write to the Sixth General Council of Con-

stantinople, "the evangelical and apostolical rectitude of the faith which is founded upon the firm rock of this Church of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, which by his favor and protection remains unsullied by any error." (Labbe, Tom. VII, p. 798.)

Thus we see the magisterium of the Church *continued uninjured.* Having before them the ex-cathedra or official pronouncements of the Popes; and the acts and decrees of the General Councils; these 165 bishops attending this Council and of whom St. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York was one, subscribed to and identified themselves with this letter. And since the days of Agatho other pontiffs, even down to our own time, have borne testimony to the wonderful fact that the Church continues to teach the identical faith of the Apostles.

Seeing, therefore, that our Lord calls the promised Messianic kingdom His Church; that He requires membership in her or else to be regarded as a heathen; that He has wonderfully endowed her with the means of salvation; that she is the God-given help to the sin-laden mortal, and that the world wonders at her permanence and continuous strength in the fulfilment of her Divine mission, why does not every person, seeking to be good, belong to her? What can be presumed to compete with her in heavenly endowments? Who will give Paradise to those despising her?

But to those doubting *which is the true Church* —the Church of the Gospel—how may it be known? Scripture gives us signs or marks, and

these are four. *Unity, Sanctity, Universality* and *Apostolicity* characterize the true Church.

Unity is the test of truth, for truth alone, as we have seen, can unite in one and the same belief, men of all times, and of all places.

Unity in the unvarying profession of one and the *same faith;* in the participation of the *same sacraments;* in the celebration of the *same sacrifice;* in the practice of the *same worship;* in the union of all the members to the *same head.*

Scriptural references to Unity:

Josue 22:16; 22:29.
Ezech. 34:23.
Matt. 12:25. Mark 3:24-25. Luke 11:17.
John 10:16; 10:26-27; 11:51-52.
Acts 4:32; 20:29-31.
Rom. 1:12; 12:5; 16:17.
1 Cor. 1:10; 10:17; 14:33.
2 Cor. 6:14; 13:11. Gal. 5:19-20.
Ephes. 4:3; 4:4-6.
Titus 3:10-11. Heb. 13:7-9.

Sanctity should be a leading characteristic of an institution established to assist persons unto sanctification. Sanctity in her Founder, in her doctrine and sacraments. Sanctity in her daily offering up of "the clean oblation from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same." (Mal. 1:11.) Sanctity in her extirpation of heresy, and in her zeal against schism.

Scriptural references to Sanctity:

Ps. 92:5.
Cant. 4:7; 6:9.
Is. 35:8; 53:9; 54:13-14.
Ezech. 43:12. Zach. 8:3.
Malach. 1:11.
Matt. 7:20. Mark 16:17-18.

John 6:45; 8:46; 15:16; 17:19.
2 Cor. 2:15-16; 4:1-2.
Ephes. 1:4; 2:21; 4:17; 5:25-27.
Philip 3:17-18. Col. 1:22. 1 Thess. 4:7.
Titus 2:11-12. Heb. 12:22.
1 Peter 1:15-16; 2:5; 2:9; 2:22.
2 Peter 1:10. 1 John 3:5.
Jude 1:17-21. Apoc. 14:1-5.

Universality must characterize the Gospel Church. She must be *universal* in *duration* adown the ages since her Founder lived, receiving persons into the vineyard of the Master at every hour.

Universal in her *doctrine,* teaching *all the truths* of Revelation.

Universal in her *empire,* extending to the limits of the earth—teacher of all nations—the world's instructor,—the International Church.

Universal in her *authority and jurisdiction,* given to her by Him to whom "all power is given in heaven and on earth."

This power, this jurisdiction, then, extends from ocean to ocean. She is, finally, the one ark of salvation for *all.*

Scriptural references to Universality:

Gen. 26:4; 28:14.
Is. 49:6; 54:2-5; 60:5; 61:8.
Ezech. 37:28; 37:38.
Dan. 2:35; 2:44. Malach. 1:11.
Matt. 13:31-32; 16:18; 24:14; 28:18-20.
Mark 4:31-32; 13:10; 16:15; 16:20.
Luke 1:33; 13:18-19; 24:47.
John 14:16.
Acts 1:8; 2:39; 13:47; 13:49.
Rom. 1:5; 1:8; 8:32; 10:18.
Colos. 1:5-6; 1:23. 1 Thess. 1:8.
1 Tim. 2:6. Titus 2:11.
1 John 2:2; 2:24. Apoc. 5:9.

Evidently, too, the Gospel Church, the one we must all hear, must be *Apostolical.* It must be the one founded by Christ on His Apostles, and governed by them and their successors to this very day. She must be the one that claims to teach what the Apostles taught, and able to prove her claims.

Scriptural references to Apostolicity:

Matt. 10:1; 10:5; 16:18; 10:40; 28:18-20; 5:13-14; 7:15.
Mark 6:7; 3:13-14; 16:15.
Luke 9:1; 6:12-13; 6:13-16; 10:16.
John 6:71; 15:16; 13:20; 20:21; 17:18; 4:2; 10:1.
Acts 1:2; 1:8; 2:42; 15:41; 16:4-5; 13:2-3; 15:2; 20:25.
Rom. 1:15; 10:14-15.
1 Cor. 11:2; 12:28. Gal. 1:18; 2:2.
Ephes. 3:7; 4:11-12. Col. 1:25
2 Thess. 2:14. 1 Tim. 1:7.
2 Tim. 2:2; 3:1-5.
Heb. 2:3; 13:7; 13:17; 5:4.
1 John 4:6. Apoc. 21:14.

She tests herself (if indeed test were needed), she approves herself by these four notes.

The *unity* that characterizes the faith of her scattered millions is the wonder of the world.

The fruits of her *sanctity* are manifest in the hosts of virgins, confessors, and martyrs, she has given the world adown the centuries.

She is so *universal* in time, place, and doctrine that she is called the universal or Catholic Church.

And that she is *apostolical* is a clear, manifest, historical fact. Daily, do her children, rejoicingly recite the Apostles' Creed.

These, then, are the marks of the Church established by *Christ,* to distinguish her from the churches instituted by *men.*

The divisions in these institutions scoff at unity; heretical doctrine and the absence of the sacraments deprive them of holiness; while their local and national character, their comparatively recent origin, the elimination of Apostolic doctrine, and the rejection of Apostolic authority, prevent them from being considered Catholic or Apostolic.

We have no excuse to offer to our readers—appealing to them for unity in the one divine faith, for constantly referring to the Church—the Catholic Church. She is the living embodiment of God's word. She is the Body of Christ. She is animated by His Spirit as if He said "I am with you all days vivifying My Mystical Body." In this Body the Spirit of Truth specially dwells since Pentecost. She is the fulfillment of the Redeemer's prayer. He and she are one. Hence St. Augustin says: "Christ and the Church are not two Christs, but one Christ."

"The Heavens shall confess Thy wonder, O Lord; and Thy Truth in the Church of the Saints."—Ps 88:6.

"The word of the Cross to them indeed that perish is foolishness; but to them that are saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God."—I Cor. 1:18. See also v. 23.

CHAPTER VIII.

SCHISM.

"Beware of false prophets."—St. Matt. 7:15.

"There shall be among you lying teachers. who shall bring in sects of perdition, . . . and many shall follow their riotousnesses, through whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."—2 Pet. 2:1, 2.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissentions, and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learnt, and avoid them."—Rom. 16:17.

"As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in Me."—St. John 15:4.

The *Century Dictionary and Encyclopaedia* defines schism to be "a formal separation within or from an existing Church or religious body, on account of some differences of opinion with regard to matters of faith and discipline." It is known to the entire world that the Anglican or Established Church of England is the result of a formal separation from the Church previously existing in England; and that this was on account of differences involving matters of discipline as well as faith; and that it remains separated in our day. This separation was started on irreligious motives by King Henry because the Pope would not allow him a divorce from his lawful wife; and it was continued by Queen Elizabeth because the Pope would not recognize her as England's lawful sovereign. Her accession having been notified to the Foreign Powers, and that "she had succeeded to the throne by

hereditary right and consent of the nation," the Pope answered that he did not understand the *hereditary right* of a person not born in lawful wedlock. His answer may have been impolitic, but it was truthful and honest, and in the interest of morality. For be it remembered that on the day that Elizabeth ascended the throne there was on the statute book a declaration that the marriage of her mother with Henry was null and void. (*Cobbett's P. Reformation,* p. 140.)

As the Catholic Church denied her legitimacy, she was animated with fanatical hatred toward it, and exercised all the resources of the English government to eradicate it. Politics and personalities ruined the faith in England.

Acts of Supremacy of Henry in 1534, and of Elizabeth in 1559, formally separated the national Church in England from the Apostolic See of Peter by declaring that it was no longer under the head of the Catholic Church, but that the sovereign should be regarded as head in *spirituals* as well as temporals. "The Pope has no more jurisdiction in England than any other bishop," declared Henry, who had previously declared the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ and hence having universal jurisdiction. Why did Henry change? Why did Henry reject the Vicar of Christ and have England reject him also? Simply because Henry was refused by the Pope a divorce from the mother of his five children, when a more fascinating beauty appeared on the scene.

Americans implore Englishmen to remem-

ber that Henry's bigamy, or *change of wives, could not abolish the jurisdiction by divine right* that the head of the Catholic Church exercised over England then; a jurisdiction which should be exercised over England today. Moreover, the rejection of this jurisdiction has ruined the unity of the faith, not only in England, but also in America.

It ought not to be necessary to remind Englishmen of facts in their own history, nor of the memorable words spoken by Archbishop Heath against the Bill of Supremacy in 1559: "By relinquishing and forsaking the See of Rome, we must forsake and fly from the unity of the Church, and by leaping out of Peter's ship, hazard ourselves to be overwhelmed and drowned in the waters of *schism,* sects and divisions." How prophetic these words were let the hundreds of sects in England today bear witness!

* * *

The Schism Act in English history, or Act of Parliament (12 Anne Stat. 2, c. 7) to prevent the growth of schism and the further security of the Church in England and Ireland as by law established, required teachers to conform to the Established Church, and refrain from attending dissenting places of worship. It was an act of politicians relative to a church *already in schism;* and made so by the Acts of Parliament of Henry and Elizabeth, conferring (what they could not confer) the spiritual supremacy on the sovereign. But schism from the Church as by law established, is not schism from the Gospel Church, and not schism in the Scriptural sense.

Let us for sake of distinction call this Church by English law re-established in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the *Ecclesia Elizabethana,* commonly called the Anglican, or Church of England. This new Church abolished the Mass and five of the Sacraments, and other matters of Catholic doctrine; and enthroned private judgment in place of a God-given infallible teaching authority, and rejected the authority of the Vicar of Christ. What is also objectionable to this private interpretation (which seems to be condemned in Art. XXXIV), is that it is the emanation of *politicians,* or persons generally not deeply versed in religious matters as members of Parliament usually are. The *new Church* sought to promulgate its *new doctrine,* not only in England, but elsewhere. In *Ware's Annals,* 1560, we read: "After the return of the Earl of Essex to Ireland, letters came from her Majesty signifying her pleasure to a general meeting of the clergy of Ireland, and the establishment of the Protestant religion through the several Dioceses of this Kingdom."

Americans consider that it makes no difference whether the faith were introduced into Britain by Roman soldiers, or through Ephesus, or by St. Paul, or through St. Eleutherius, or by the Irish, or later through St. Gregory, it was *Catholic faith* in each case. This talk of England not getting her faith direct from Rome, and therefore she ought not to acknowledge Rome, is idle, ignorant and malicious talk. One would think, hearing such talk, that Peter had one faith, and Paul another, and John another. All the Apostles taught *Gospel* or

Catholic faith; and those who in the early centuries most emphatically taught, as Gospel truth, the supremacy of Peter and his successors, were the Orientals; for Orientals composed almost entirely the first four General Councils, yea, the first seven Councils.

It is, sometimes, wildly asserted also, that the English Church of A. D. 1492 called the *Ecclesia Anglicana,* as the Irish Church has been called the *Ecclesia Hibernica,* was not the Catholic Church. Ecclesia Anglicana, Ecclesia Hibernica—the Church in England, the Church in Ireland (as the Pope addresses them today)—was ample designation, for then it was not necessary to qualify them: no State or Dissenting Church existed then. Americans find that in A. D. 1492 there was a Church in England which was part of the Church established by Christ; and that the Pope was believed by Englishmen to be the Vicar of Christ and Head of that Church; that now there is a Church of England, established by law and separated from the Vicar of Christ. Moreover, that this Church as established by law is evidently *not the same* as the one already existing in A. D. 1492. And this fact can be established beyond all doubt by a tory Peer, by an Englishman holding the office of Earl Marshal of England whose very office is to verify legal successorships. This person is the Duke of Norfolk.

Let the Ecclesia Hibernica corroborate his evidence. English historians tell us that the Celts (British and Irish) united with the Romans to Catholicize England. They succeeded. This Ec-

clesia Hibernica is the same today as it was fifteen centuries ago. The Irish hierarchy never changed; and the faith, such as it was, long before Augustine landed in England, is still practiced in Erin. And the Irish Hierarchy solemnly declare that the Pope was the head of their Church then as today; and that the Ecclesia Elizabethana—the State Church of England, *is not the same* as their ancient Church in faith, in government, and in worship. The testimony of these two authorities—secular and ecclesiastical, *is clear and decisive to Americans,* as it must be *to the world at large.*

* * *

If the Ecclesia Elizabethana is, then, in a state of schism, or separation from the Church of the Gospel—the Church of the first four Councils—the Church identified with Peter and Peter's successors, if it has departed from former belief, evidently it is not part of the Kingdom of God. It is merely a *creature of the State,* a *department of the State.* Here is what Rev. R. C. Fellingham of the Ecclesia Elizabethana writes in the *London Tablet*: "I am a State Official, am no sacrificing priest nor am I going to be. My Church is a dependent of the State, State-created and State-governed, and I will not be silent when some of its members pretend that it is a teaching communion in the same sense that the Catholic Church is. * * * Parliament *alone* is an *ultimate authority in Doctrine and Ritual.*"

And yet this seems rather at variance with the Royal Supremacy. We read in the English press reports that towards the end of 1908, the Bishop of Newcastle refused to ordain Mr. H. C. S. Morris

because he refused to take without reservation the oath binding the candidate to accept the *decision of the Sovereign* as *final* in matters ecclesiastical. This is of course in compliance with the Act of 1534 making King Henry, his heirs and successors, the Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England with full power to visit, reform and correct all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempt and enormities which by any manner of spiritual authority ought to be reformed and corrected. (Ling. Vol. VI., p. 214.)

This legislation was renewed in 1559 when Parliament enacted "that the jurisdiction necessary for the correction of errors, heresies, schisms and abuses should be annexed to the crown, * * * that magistrates and inferior officers should take an oath declaring Elizabeth to be supreme governor in all ecclesiastical and spiritual things or causes as well as temporal, and renouncing all foreign ecclesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within the realm." (Ling. Vol. VII., p. 259, 260.)

Granted, then, that the Ecclesia Elizabethana is in a state of schism from the ancient Church; and that she is separated not only from the Apostolic See of Rome, but also from every other Apostolic See, let us take a glance at the Bible. *Nowhere* do we find a text authorizing a church in opposition to the Gospel Church already established. *Nowhere* do we find it permitted to transfer the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to a prince having the keys of a kingdom on earth. *Nowhere* do we find that

Christ established His Church on Herod or Pilate, or made them her head. But we *do* find the Master emphatically saying, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, but to God the things that are God's." And we *do* find that schism is a sin; and sects and divisions in the Christian body forbidden. And we *do* find too, and find with regret, that the National Church in England, is to-day in a state of schism; and that the cry that disgraced humanity—the cry of the turbulent Jews, "We will have no king but Caesar" has resounded throughout England for the past three centuries to the rejection of the spiritual sway of the Vicar of our Divine Master.

If it be true, as some Englishmen would have us believe, that St. Paul introduced the faith into Britain, then why don't Englishmen attend to his advice and doctrine (1 Cor. 12: 25), that there be no schism in the body? Let us ask Englishmen as he asked the Corinthians: "Is Christ divided?" And as Clement of Rome healed the schism of the Corinthians, cannot his successor, Pius X, heal the schism of the English? St. Paul, too, ranks schism and heresy with the sins of murder and idolatry, and declares that the author of sects shall not possess the Kingdom of God (Gal. 5: 20-21). If the Gospel Church—the Church identified with Peter—the Catholic Church, is the voice of God adown the ages, then we find this Church hurling her anathemas at schismatics. We find the Fathers loud in their denunciation of schism, and if Englishmen be sincere in their respect for Jerome, or

Chrysostom, or Gregory, or Athanasius, or Ambrose, or Augustin, why then don't they terminate their schism, since schism was so abhorrent to those Fathers?

Are our human bodies merely disjointed, disconnected parts, severed from the head? Of course not. Well then the true Church, being the Mystic Body of Christ, is not in disjointed sections, or discordant parts, but one harmonious whole. Thus all the members are in unison with one another and connected with the head—(the man who is the Vicar of Christ): the whole vivified and directed by Christ that is "the Head of every man"—1 Cor. 11:3, and who is Head of all the Church. Let it then be emphasized that the Church is the Mystic Body of Christ animated and enlightened by His Spirit and the Spirit of Truth: His representative and more—*She is His Mystical Self*—"He that hears you hears Me." How can such a Church teach error, or be destroyed?

"We are the children of the Saints, and look for that life which God will give to those that never change their faith from Him."—Tobias 2:18.

"Because of unbelief they were broken off. But thou standest by faith: be not high-minded, but fear." —Rom. 11:20.

O God, hasten the day for Thy people's sake when Thy faithful can address the returned secessionists in the words of Paul: "Now you are the body of Christ and members of member." I Cor. 12:27.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH ON SCHISM.

"Be not led away with various and strange doctrines."—Heb. 13:9.

"When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will teach you all truth."—St. John 16:13.

What the Fathers have written on the sin of Schism would make a very ponderous volume indeed. Few of them, however, have used stronger words against Schism than the great Apostle of the Gentiles who places it in the list of sins that exclude from Paradise. (Gal. 5:20-21.) The glorious martyr St. Ignatius uses pretty strong language towards the supporters of a Schism, saying: "Be not deceived; whosoever followeth one that created Schism, he inheriteth not the Kingdom of God." (Ex. ad Philadelph.)

St. Jerome, A. D. 376, says "Wherefore among 12 one is chosen, that by the appointment of a head occasion of Schism might be taken away." (C. 1. Contra Jovin.) "Let one Eve be the mother of all the living, and one Church the parent of all Christians." (Ad Agron. n. 12, col. 902.)

Writing to Pope Damasus, he says:

"I am linked in communion with thy Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. On that rock I know that the Church is built. Whoso shall

eat the Lamb outside this house is profane. * * I do not know Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I am ignorant of Paulinus.

Whoso gathereth not with thee, scattereth; that is, he who is not of Christ is of anti-Christ." (Ep. XV.)

Who were Vitalis and Miletius and Paulinus? They were heretical bishops.[1]) About the year 375 St. Jerome was in Syria, and found himself in the midst of numerous heretics of various sects. In the town of Antioch, where he was staying, each of these three was using every effort to have him join his sect. Hence he wrote the above letter to the Pope for guidance. Before the reply came, he wrote a second letter, telling them: "Whoever is *joined to the Chair of Peter is mine.*" But as each of the three claimed to have the Pope on his side, he implored the Pope "that you will let me know by your letter, with whom I should hold communion." (Ep. ad Damas.) Anglicans today should do precisely as Jerome did. Another grand lesson does he teach the world, and it is that union or communion with the See of Peter is the test of membership in the Gospel Church, and not in belief in individual articles of faith; for communion with the Apostolic See gives assurance of correct faith.

Jeremiah of old said to the rebellious Jews: "Thine own wickedness shall reprove thee, and thy apostasy shall rebuke thee. Know thou, and see that it is an evil and a bitter thing for thee to have left the Lord thy God, and that My fear

is not with thee, saith the Lord of Hosts."—Jer. 2:19. And Jerome says to rebellious Christians:

"That there is one altar in the Church, and one faith, and one baptism, the Apostle teaches; which altar the heretics have abandoned, and have built for themselves many altars, not to render God propitious, but unto the multiplication of sins. For which cause they deserve not to receive the laws of God, seeing that the laws which they had received they despised; and should they say anything concerning the Scriptures, it is not to be likened to the words of God, but to the sentiments of the Gentiles." (T. VI, l. II, Comm. in Osee, col. 88.)

Americans see that these words addressed by Jerome to the heretics in his day, have a wonderful application to England. England's conversion will be difficult for she sinned against the light too grievously, and under too trivial a provocation. Assuming that the testimony given by Englishmen is true, then, we find that in A. D. 1492 there was one altar and one faith upheld throughout England as God's. And we find that in the next century this altar was abandoned and many opposition altars built. And the deserters said much concerning the Scriptures to justify this unjustifiable abandonment of God's Altar; and flooded the world with Bibles in an effort of atonement!

Sectaries called after their ancient founders, as well as Lutherans, Wesleyans, Calvinists and

others bearing modern names ought to read very attentively these words of St. John Chrysostom addressed to all such: "When you hear of people who call themselves Christians, but who are not called after Christ, but after another * * * rest assured that they do not form the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of Satan."

"Nothing so *provokes* God as the division of the Church. Even though we may have done ten thousand good things, yet shall we, if we cut to pieces the fullness of the Church, suffer no less a punishment than they that mangled His body." (Hom. XI, in Ep. ad Ephes.)

Anglicans evidently in Schism and heresy from God's altar and faith as in England in A. D. 1492; and yet praying in the Litany to be delivered "from all false doctrine, heresy and Schism;" and saying the prayer of St. John Chrysostom "for the knowledge of God's saving truth," ought certainly read the above words with the deepest sincerity, and *faithfully and religiously follow them;* for it is about time to have their prayers efficacious.

St. Gregory of Nyssa says: "If any part be out of the body it is utterly disconnected with the head." (T. III. de Perfect. Christ. Form., p. 289.)

St. Gregory of Nazianzus says: "The faith (of Rome) was of old, and still is now, *right,* binding the whole west by the saving word: as is just in her who presides over all, reverencing the whole harmonious teaching of God." (Carmen de vita sua, 568-72.)

The appeal of St. Athanasius for unity in his

time ought to be effective today. "As for remaining on the foundation of the Apostles, and holding to the traditions of the Fathers, pray that now at length all contention and emulation may cease, and that all the insane questions, and logomachies of the heretics may be condemned, * * * and the truth shine in every heart, so that all may everywhere speak the same thing, and think the same thing, and that no Arian blasphemies remaining, there may be proclaimed and confessed throughout every church *one Lord, one faith,* one baptism, in Christ Jesus our Lord." (De Synodis, No. 54, t. 1, p. 2, p. 612.)

And again he says that "the holy and veritable among heralds of truth are of one mind, and differ not themselves." (T. 1 de Decret. Niceaen. No. 4.)

St. Ambrose says: "He (Christ) also declares that they who divide the Lord's Church are moved by a devilish spirit; that thus He might at once comprise the heretics and schismatics of all times, to whom to deny forgiveness; forasmuch as every (other) sin has for its object individuals, whilst this is against all men. For they alone who tear in pieces the members of the Church, for which the Lord Jesus suffered and the Holy Ghost has been given unto us, seek to render void the grace of Christ." (T. 2, l. 2, de Poenitent. c. 4, no. 24, p. 421-422.)

"Learn from this that all heretics and schismatics are separated from the kingdom of God, and from the Church; and it is therefore manifest that

all assemblies of schismatics and heretics are not of God, but of the unclean spirit." (T. 1, Expos. Ev. St. Lucae, n. 95, p. 1453.)

St. Optatus says that "Schismatics are like branches cut off the vine, doomed to punishment, reserved like dry wood for the fire of hell." (De Schism. Donat. lib. 1, No. 6-10.)

Clement of Alexandria says that "in substance, in doctrine, in origin, in excellence the ancient and Catholic Church, is unique, * * * but the excellency of the Church like the principle of everything concrete, is in unity surpassing all other things, and having nothing similar or equal to itself." (T. 1, Strom. lib. vii. p. 899. Venet. 1757.)

St. Cyprian: "Does anyone believe that this unity which comes from the divine strength, and coheres in celestial sacraments, can be divided in the Church, and can be separated by the parting asunder of opposing wills? He who does not keep to the unity does not keep God's Law." (Cyp. De Unitate, p. 109. Oxford, 1682.)

"God is one and Christ is one, and faith is one, and the people is one, united into the substantial unity of a body by the cement of concord. Unity cannot be severed nor can the one body be separated by division of the structure." (Ib. p. 119.)

"Heresies and schisms are the devil's inventions, wherewith to subvert faith, to corrupt truth, and rend unity."

"In order to manifest unity, He has, by His own authority, so placed the origin of that same unity, as that it begins from one (Peter)."

"How can two or three be *gathered together* in Christ's name, who are *manifestly separated* from Christ and from His Gospel? For we did not go out from them, but they went out from us. And as heresies and schisms have a later birth, when men set up different conventicles for themselves, they have left the fountain head and origin of truth." (De Unitate.)

St. Augustin says: "These testimonies do we produce from the Holy Scriptures, that it may be seen, that it is not easy for anything to be *more grievous* than the sacrilege of schism; because there is no just necessity for severing unity." (Lib. II., contra Ep. Parmeniani, n. 25, p. 103.)

Americans see that there was certainly no just cause for severing unity in 1534. If Henry wanted to marry a dozen wives, and wanted to quit the Church himself, he was at liberty to do so; but he should not interfere with the rights of conscience and force his people from communion with Rome at the point of the sword. Neither should Elizabeth compel her people to give up the Bishop of Rome. She was not, *could not be,* head of the Church in spirituals. None of her successors on the throne enjoy this headship. Impossible! It is not in the gift of politicians. It is of record that they tried it, but their action is regarded as a glaring farce by all save the illiterate. But what about Canterbury? Americans witness from time to time tests between Parliament representing the civil power and Canterbury representing the spiritual, and *Canterbury has to obey.* Does England need another Magna Charta?

England is not an integral part of the Church to-day. If the king be head of the so-called Church of England, as Act of Parliament says, then it has no head in reality. And if Canterbury be the head, why does it not maintain its authority? Protestant Episcopalians of America are loosely connected with Canterbury, but with what See is Canterbury connected?

If India or Canada become independent, it is no longer an integral part of the British Empire. In the same manner if the Church in any nation secedes from the Church Government whose headquarters are at Rome, it is in a state of separation or schism. As well say that the United States is an integral part of England, as that the Anglican establishment is an integral part of the Church.

"I say and protest," writes St. John Chrysostom, "that it is as wrong to divide the Church as to fall into heresy." (Hom. XX. in Ep. ad Ephes. No. 5.)

And as no heresy is justifiable, so also no schism. There is no justification for schism. But what about a condition where heresy is piled on to schism? Has England fallen into such a deadly lethargy as not to see that she is separated from Pope and Patriarch, and that a limb that is amputated is lifeless? And being in schism, "it is not easy for anything to be more grievous than the sacrilege of schism."

It is too bad that Englishmen did not heed what Chrysostom wrote: *"Secede not from the Church,* for nothing is stronger than the Church. Thy

hope is the Church, thy salvation is the Church, thy refuge is the Church. It is higher than the heavens, wider than the earth. It never grows old, but is full of vigor. Wherefore, Holy Writ, pointing to its strength and stability, calls it a mountain." (Hom. De Capt. Eutrop.)

If then schism be such a damnable condition according to the Scriptures and the Fathers, why retard reunion a day? Every worthy Anglican ought to listen to the words of St. Dionysius of Alexandria: "But if thou even now persuade or compel thy brethren to return to unity, thy good deed will be greater than thy fault; and this will not be set against thee and that praised. But if thou canst not gain over the obstinate, save thine own soul." (Ep. ad Novat., p. 130.)

"We cease not to pray for you, and to beg that you may be filled with the knowledge of His will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding: . . . . Giving thanks to God the Father, who hath made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the Saints in light.—Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love.—In whom we have redemption through His Blood, the remission of sins."—Col. 1:9-14.

"But God hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honor, that there be no schism in the body; but the members might be mutually careful one for another." I Cor. 12:24, 25.

1) See "The Four Doctors," by the Cath. Truth Soc., London, England.

CHAPTER X.

SOME FALSE CHARGES.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."—8th Precept.

It is, then, quite clear from English history that the separation from Rome was due to personal differences involving matters of discipline and faith. But when the change was effected, we find Anglicans making charges against the Church to palliate the separation. They held the Church accountable for the sins of some of its leaders and members. As well hold Christ and His Apostles responsible for the conduct of Judas; or St. Paul for the licentious Corinthian.

As her Master was unjustly accused, so is His Church. She is accused of corrupting Christian doctrine. And her accusers open the Bible to prove it indeed! And they are surprised to find that the Bible itself is her vindication. For if the Church wished to corrupt Christian doctrine, the most effective way would be to corrupt the Scriptures, as they were in her keeping. And she points out triumphantly she did not. But she is accused all the same. We have the King James version, because the Anglican Church represented by 1,000 of its ministers condemned, as full of errors, the first three translations of the Bible

which had led to the conversion of England to Protestantism. (*Cath. Doc. Nampon,* p. 144.) Too late, alas, too late, the harm was done!

The Reformers rejected whole books of the Bible. "When Luther was caught translating *justificari hominem per fidem,* by *man is justified by faith* ONLY; how did he reply? 'If your papist pretends to make a great noise about this addition of the word *sola,* tell him that Doctor Martin Luther wills it so. * * * *Sic volo, sic jubeo* (thus do I wish, thus do I order). We will not be disciples of the papists who regard it as a sin to falsify Scripture, but their masters and judges.' " (In a pamphlet entitled *Answers to Two Questions.* See Dollinger, *The Reformation,* Vol. III., p. 148.) (See also *Luther's Own Statements,* Henry O'Connor, S. J.)

"In virtue of this principle that intrepid forger (Luther) allowed himself to give a false and heretical sense to fourteen hundred texts of Scripture." (*Cath. Doc. Nampon, p.* 143.)

Friends of Luther defend him over this *sola* matter. Well, assuming this defence correct, there is, otherwise, ample evidence that he *mutilated the Bible,* having received it from the Church that by her authority pronounced it inspired. He was, then, not justified in discriminating against her dictum. Oh no, he was no teacher divinely appointed against the Gospel Church. "And, now, at this day we see his 'Complete Works' prohibited among his own sect in Saxony as a bad book." (*Introd. Cath. Doc.,* Nampon p. xv.)

In 1603 James I (whose mother and wife were

Catholics) said in Parliament, "I acknowledge that the Church of Rome is our Mother Church." Now let us reason a little with Englishmen. Rightly or wrongly, your Church is sprung from the Catholic Church, whose head is in Rome. History tells the close connection in ecclesiastical matters between England and Rome until the reign of Henry VIII. You must maintain that Rome was right in doctrine even for *your own sake.* And being right, were Anglicans right or wrong to separate from her? This is the great question for Englishmen to solve. Even if you could overthrow the Church by proving her to be false, you would as Churchmen be merely pursuing a suicidal policy, such as Samson exercised when he pulled down the hall on himself and the Philistines. For if Rome were utterly wrong before the Reformation, then England, having her identical doctrine, *was utterly wrong.* And if Rome were wrong, how could Anglicans become right? If Rome were dead in faith, then so also was the Church in England dead in faith. And if the tree of which you were a branch, utterly failed, how could you revive it? And the Church as a Divine Institution would have utterly failed, if she failed in one essential matter of faith. Now in what essential matter of faith has she failed?

But some person may say, "I won't believe she is right, she is wrong." Well then it should be *proved,* not merely asserted. We all want the truth.

Either the Catholic Church is true and divine, and must be obeyed in spirituals, or the Ecclesia

Elizabethana is. Those called Non-Conformists in England today cannot be the true Church. *They cannot have the true faith.* Those rejecting the already existing, lawful Church, and appealing to the Bible, receive a glaring condemnation from it. They open the Sacred Writings and they see, "He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen." (St. Matt. 18: 17.) What Church? Can any reasonable person doubt what Church is here meant? Evidently it is the one existing from our Savior's time—the Gospel Church. Surely it is not a church the rebel is going to start—a church *not yet in existence.* Certainly not one that would be started 1,600 years after the words were spoken. And still on the penalty of being regarded by Christ as heathens and damnable, they start a new organization which they dignify with the name of church. But they want officers for the new organization and they read "Obey them that have the rule over you and be subject to them. For they watch as being to render an account of your souls." (Heb. 13: 17.)

"Be not led away with various and strange doctrines." (Heb. 13: 9.)

The rebellious, therefore, should return to their obedience, lay down their arms, burn their inflammatory speeches, and surrender to their bishops. "No," they may say, "we have authority." Well, let us see it. Luther asked those reformers differing with him to give proof of *their authority.* They could not, neither could *he.* He and his partners lost their *ordinary mission,* being suspended clergymen, and they could not prove they had an *ex-*

traordinary one. And if they gave no proof, and could give none, why should people believe their absurdities and pretensions? The entire Christian world today knows that Christ existed, delivered His heavenly message to mankind, and founded His Church to transmit that message *accurately* adown the ages. She is transmitting that message to the world today, and the Master is co-operating with her. "I am with you *all days*, even to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt. 28: 20.) Yes, He is in active co-operation today with the Church teaching the nations (England included) to observe all things whatsoever He commanded: and we wish to emphasize this for the benefit of those Christian heroes and Scriptural interpreters who assert that He abandoned the Church for the 800 years preceding Henry's divorce. And they would never be guilty of staining paper with such an infamous untruth, only that Henry made his divorce. Then defamation of the old Church was sure to follow. Either Henry's Divorced Church (or its identical, the Ecclesia Elizabethana), is the Catholic Church, or an integral part of it. But it is neither. If it be the Catholic Church, if the Pan-Anglican be the one to teach the world—the depositary of the faith—the inheritor of the promises—the recipient of the Divine guarantee against error, then why doesn't she claim to be and prove it? But she never dared do this. Neither is she an integral part, for Greek and Roman repudiate her. To have the Ecclesia Elizabethana, or any of the sects take the place of the true Church, three things should be proved.

1. That the first Church—the Gospel Church —the Church founded upon the Blessed Peter, and ruled by him and his successors in Rome, *failed in her mission as Teacher of the nations;* that she did not teach the truth, did not teach "the faith once delivered to the Saints;" and hence lost her authority as Divine Teacher.

2. That *this authority was transferred to the new sect;* or that the founders of the new sect got a *special heavenly revelation* to reform the Church.

3. That such a sect today *possesses this authority confirmed by miracles,* or signs from Heaven. In fine, that such a sect is now the Divine Teacher of the world which *all must hear.*

As her mission to be the world's teacher was conferred upon her by the world's Master in clear and wonderful terms, so Americans want ample data, giving *clear and conclusive proof,* that this mission, or right and authority to teach is *withdrawn;* and transferred to another. It will not do to merely prove (if proved it can be) that the Catholic Church failed or erred in matters of faith. This would be poor comfort to humanity. Man today wants the Teacher provided for him by the Master. Man wants that living authority that must be somewhere teaching today with the co-operation of the Master.

Ah! where is that authority except in the Catholic Church? She did not err in faith in the past, nor does she today, *she never can.* "Jesus Christ yesterday, today and forever." So also His truth—His word—His Church—the embodiment

of that word. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, My word shall never pass away."

"But I can guide myself with my Bible," says the man who knows that he is really *not guided*. "But God will guide me in reading it." Well, if God guide, it is *not to disunity*, but to unity according to His own plan, and wish, and prayer. He will guide you, if you be sincere, to that Teacher that He wishes you to *obey*. "He that hears you, hears Me." It is mere insanity to claim that God will direct any man to run counter to the authority He has Himself set up, and to which He demands obedience under penalty of damnation! "He that will not hear the Church let him be unto thee as the heathen."

"He that believeth in the Son hath Life Everlasting: but he that believeth not in the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."—John 3.36.

"Detract not one another my brethren." St. James 4.11.

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak ye the truth every man with his neighbor: for we are members one of another." Eph. 4:25.

That illustrious convert to the Church, St. Paul, thus instructs Timothy to correct false doctrine: to denounce certain false teachers: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine. . . . Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned:

"From which some having swerved have turned aside into vain jangling:

"Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." I Tim. 1.3-7. King James' Version.

CHAPTER XI.

IS THE PAPACY BASED ON SCRIPTURAL GROUNDS?

"And Jesus, looking upon him, said: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter."—St. John 1:42.

Sometime afterwards we find this promise fulfilled thus:

"Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am?

Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God.

And Jesus, answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in heaven.

And I say to thee: That thou art Peter (i.e., Rock);

And upon this rock I will build My Church,

And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."—St. Matt. 16:15, 19.

Who can reasonably deny that Peter was signally honored by these wonderful words? Who can reasonably deny that these Divine words confer special dignity? And who can reasonably deny that the Papacy—the office of this honor and dignity—is Scriptural? No one. Our Saviour confirms Peter's testimony that He is the Son of God ("My Father"); and confers on Peter the keys—the highest authority and power in the Kingdom—the highest power of teaching, making laws, and judging.

The *Century Dictionary* defines the Papacy to be "that system of ecclesiastical government which

recognizes and is based upon the Apostolic primacy and supreme authority of the Pope or Bishop of Rome over the Church universal." The Papacy is simply the office, dignity and authority of the Pope, the Bishop of Rome as successor of the Fisherman. The Church is like a goodly ship built by Christ in which all who would find salvation must be saved, as the eight were saved in the ark. (1 Peter 3:20.) It is regrettable that a sailor nation should have to be reproached with leaving the barque of Peter. But the signs of the times indicate an inclination to return and work with the rest of the crew under the direction of the captain. As a ship must have a captain whom all should obey; an army, a general; a government, a head—be he king or president—an hereditary or an elected ruler; so the Church of Christ, as a visible institution, founded for men, must have a ruler, whom all must acknowledge, and to whom the members may have access in case of appeal or doubt. Also to do her work—that is to save souls—the Church must always be visible to the souls seeking her in earnestness and truth; she must have preachers to bring the faith, and listeners to acquire it by hearing; she must have administrators of the Sacraments or dispensers of the "Mysteries of God," and see that they are dispensed aright; she was designed to be the light of the world for the enlightenment of men; and those who say that the light was extinguished are practically denying Christianity.

For ten centuries and more the English regarded Peter's successors as their captains. As the result

of repudiating his Apostolic See, Peter has been furiously assailed by Anglicans. In that religious mutiny Peter's authority was rejected, his Christ-given name was attacked, his See in Rome was ignored and his residence there denied. It was claimed that England received the faith through another source than the former favorite Peter; and that *he* had no primacy of jurisdiction. In fine, it was hoped that the Papacy would soon be a thing of the past in the British Empire, and consequently that its God-given authority to be the herald of truth and strength of the faithful was to be destroyed.

It was indeed a fierce attack. But after the conflict of 300 years Americans can see Peter victorious, and Anglicans *defeated at every point of attack.* Why should the Papacy be assailed anyhow? If its rock-built citadel is the work of the Master in vain do men and devils assail it. We can understand why hell's gates should try to prevail against it, but why *man,* for whom that citadel was instituted, should attack it, is quite beyond comprehension. All the same, Pius X during his recent golden jubilee received the homage of men and nations, princes and potentates, not as a temporal ruler, but Supreme Pontiff in that Kingdom not of this world. Pius X has no more loyal children than the Catholics of the United States (numbering about one-fifth of the population). Neither does it militate against allegiance to the Stars and Stripes to be obedient to the Vicar of Christ in spirituals.

Peter's Special Dignity.

That Peter had special dignity and authority conferred on him is evident from the Scriptures. England edifyingly observes the Sunday. And although there is ten times more evidence on the Sacred Page for the special dignity of Peter than for the transferring of the day of Observance from the Sabbath to the Sunday, nevertheless, the Sunday is *faithfully observed,* and the Papacy is *faithlessly rejected.* The day is respected as it should be, but the Christian Government that established the day is disrespected. Civilization, the result of Christianity, is esteemed, but the center, from which this Christianity has been diffused, is rejected.

As Jehovah gave Abraham as a father to the Jews on account of his faith, so did Christ give Peter to the Christians. When our Lord first saw Simon He said he would be called a rock man—Peter. (St. John, 1: 42.) When Simon made that wonderful profession of faith, revealed to him by the Father, then our Lord fulfilled His promise made two years before, and appointed him—constituted him—the rock on which He would build His Church, our Lord comparing His Church to a building of which He Himself is the Builder. "A wise man," said He at the end of His Sermon on the Mount, "builds his house upon a rock;" and hence our Lord meant to build His Church upon a rock, that rock being Peter. And He told Peter He would give him the keys. Giving a person the keys of the house, gives him au-

thority over the house and its inmates; that is, the Church and its members. The promise which our Lord on this occasion made to Peter, that He would give him supreme authority over His Church, we find fulfilled and confirmed after the resurrection when He referred to the faithful as a *flock,* and made Peter Chief Pastor.

Christ's Church *commenced with Peter.* He was the *first man* who made a sublime confession of faith in Christ. If, then, Peter is actually made, on account of that profession of faith, the foundation or *commencement of the Church* by the Master; that is, if he supports it, as a foundation is expected to do, his Primacy must continue an essential part of the Church's Constitution, or base, as long as the Church stands. You can never dispense with the foundation. And if he supports it, and thus governs and controls it, as a foundation is intended to do, his Primacy is not a mere Primacy of honor, but also of jurisdiction and control.

If Christ promised Peter the keys of the kingdom, that signifies He promised him the supreme power in the kingdom. Giving Peter His own prophetic name of rock, giving him the keys, the symbol of His own sovereign power (Apoc. 1: 18; 3: 7) indicates He was making Him Vicar. What the Good Shepherd authorized Peter to do for Him was to feed His flock,—to teach and govern the faithful *without any limitation.* And it is *the test* that they are of His flock if they hear Peter's voice.

He made Peter the stay or supporter of the brethren. "I have prayed for *thee* that *thy faith fail not*: and *thou* being once converted, *confirm thy brethren.*" (Luke 22:32.)

Peter's Distinctions.

That Peter was specially honored, or had the supremacy, is evidenced by the various distinctions conferred on him by our Lord.

To him *alone* did He give a new name.

To him *alone* did He give a name bearing upon the constitution of the Church.

To him *alone* did He promise that he should be a fisher of men.

To him *alone* did He foretell that he would die a martyr's death.

In the great events of our Lord's life, Peter's name especially is mentioned: as at the promise of the Church (St. Matt. 16:18); at the payment of the tribute (St. Matt. 17:23-26); in Christ's teaching from Peter's bark (St. Luke 5:3); at the Transfiguration (St. Matt. 17:1-2); at the Washing of the Feet (St. John 13:6); at the Pasch (St. Luke 22:8); and at the Resurrection (St. John, chap. 20).

The Apostles themselves evidently regarded him as their head, for in each of the four lists given by the Evangelists his name is placed first, nay, emphatically *the first* in one (St. Matt. 10:2).

Primate does Peter appear in everything. The *first* to confess the faith; the *first* to declare his love; the *first* of the Apostles to see the risen Lord; the *first* to witness Him before the people; the *first* to confirm the faith by a miracle; the *first* to convert the Jews; the *first* to admit the Gentiles. It is Peter who casts out of the Church the first heretic, Simon Magus (Acts 8: 21); who makes the first

Apostolic visitation of the Church (Acts 9:32), and who pronounced the first dogmatic decision (Acts 15: 7). So important is he that his name is mentioned ninety-one times in the New Testament, while the Beloved Disciple is mentioned only thirty-eight times.

Yes, Peter had special power; and the first twelve chapters of the Acts are a record of its exercise.

Taking the four Petrine texts:

"Thou art Peter (a rock); and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (St. Matt. 16:18.)

"And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (St. Matt. 16:19.)

"And the Lord said: Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you (*the plural referring to all the Apostles*), that he may sift you (*the plural*) as wheat; but I have prayed (*not for all, but*) for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren." (St. Luke 22:31-32.)

"Feed My lambs * * * Feed My sheep." (St. John 21:15-17.)

and these other texts and proofs, is it any wonder that the Fathers were enthusiastic in saluting Peter as Head of the Church; and that the Councils willingly acknowledged that great honor?

And while our Savior made Peter the foundation and support of the Church, committing to him

the entire pastoral care, we know He made other selections in Apostles to be his associates. And whatever He promised them was promised conjointly with Peter; *never anything independent of him.* Thus He gave them the power of binding and loosing, but it was *after* He had given Peter the keys.

Even the angels recognize a prominence in Peter, for at the resurrection, the heavenly envoy tells the women "go tell the disciples and *Peter.*" (Mark 16: 7.) God, Himself, wonderfully endorsed the headship of Peter by miracles; even the very shadow of his body curing all diseases. (Acts 5: 15.)

"I do believe, Lord: help my unbelief."—Mark 9:23.

And the Apostles said to the Lord: "Increase our faith."—St. Luke 17:5.

"But now there are many members indeed, yet one body."—I Cor. 12:20.

Let us ask "Have all the members a right to their place in the body except the head?"

"Why refuse to give the head that position it ought to hold in that Divine corporation composed however of human beings."

"Why would persons try to deprive Peter of the keys he received for the benefit of humanity?"

"Why should they try to deprive the Chief Pastor of the authority conferred on him by the Good Shepherd?"

CHAPTER XII.

DOES THE CHURCH MAINTAIN THAT THE PAPACY IS SCRIPTURAL?

"Feed My lambs, . . . My sheep."
—St. John 21:15,17.

From these words and from other astounding words addressed to Simon Peter by Him, who has all power in heaven and on earth, the church does certainly maintain that the Papacy is Scriptural.

Not to mention the emphatic language of the Vatican Council relative to the Headship and Prerogatives of the Holy Father, let us go back to the General Council of Florence held A. D. 1442. The Council declares: "We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world; that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and to him in blessed Peter was delivered by Christ full power to feed, rule and govern the universal Church, as is also contained in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils and in the sacred canons." At this Council Schismatic Greeks attended. Yea, the formula of their ultimatum, after prolonged discussion, and proposed in the words of their own Greek Fathers, declares for the Papal Supremacy.

The Pope and Cardinals signed this decree or deed of union first; next the Greek Emperor, after which follow the prelates of both parties; the whole number of subscribers being thirty-two Greeks and 114 Latins. Pope Eugenius was much pained by the refusal of Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus, to sign. This dissentient met with a sudden death.

The defection of the Schismatic Greeks centuries before, the celebrated reunion at Lyons, A. D. 1274, and the subsequent notorious violation of those principles declared before that Council, now required that at the Florentine reunion of the East and the West, the belief in the Papal Supremacy should be more formally and emphatically declared before the world.

When the Greek bishops tried to promulgate the Florentine decrees, rioting broke out amongst their people; and soon after Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks. The Schismatic Greeks for centuries have been enslaved, degraded and persecuted by the Turk, as a just punishment for their rejection of the Florentine decree, and for their unjustifiable schism.

* * *

As Anglo-Saxons received the faith through St. Gregory, whom they regarded as their father in Christ, his words ought, certainly, to command the respect of Englishmen. And he says, "As the four Gospels, so also I accept the four Councils." (Ep. 1, ad Joan. Const.) Again he says, "All persons whom the forementioned venerable Councils re-

ject, I reject; all whom they reverence I embrace. * * * Whosoever, therefore, believeth otherwise, let him be anathema."

What then does the Head of the Church that sent Augustine to the English require them to believe as firmly as the four Gospels? The Papacy.

The special honor and authority of the Roman See was mentioned at the first General Council, A. D. 325. And it was afterwards quoted in the 16th Act of the Council of Chalcedon that the Fathers at Nice had already declared that "the Roman Church always had the Primacy."

In connection with the second General Council,—Constantinople, A. D. 381, in the letter which the Fathers wrote to Pope Damasus I., as recorded by Theodoret in the 5th book of his Ecclesiastical History (Chap. 9), they acknowledged that the Roman Church is the Head and they the members.

For in 382 a Council assembled which may be regarded as a continuation of the one held the previous year. These wrote to the Pope setting forth what had been done in the Synod of 381. Damasus replying calls the Bishops "most honored sons."

The Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, also affords testimony of the Supremacy, declaring "that it had been known to all ages and was doubted by none that the blessed Apostle Peter, Prince and Head of the Apostles, received the keys of the Kingdom from the Savior of the world;" and that "Peter lives and exercises judgment in his successors."

Englishmen believing in and bound by this Council, yea, claiming, betimes, to receive your faith through Ephesus, yet *doubting,* denying the Headship of Peter, and thus scandalizing the Christian world, should read carefully every word of the above. This Council teaches two things which you should never forget—that Mary is truly the Mother of God Incarnate; and that the successor of Peter is the "captain, the ruler, the leader, the safe guide of God's people on earth."

The Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, is specially prominent in acknowledging the Supremacy in its convocations, its sessions, and in the approbation of its canons. In the first three Acts of the Council, the Fathers several times called Pope Leo, the pontiff reigning at the time, "the Bishop of the Universal Church * * * to whom the Savior has entrusted the guardianship of the Vineyard (the Church)." Dioscorus is deposed for "daring to hold a Council without the authority of the Holy See." (Cath. Belief and other treatises.)

The act of deposition of Dioscorus was proclaimed by the Synod to be the act of Leo. "Leo hath deprived him," and it is accomplished "with Peter the Apostle, the rock and foundation of the Church." "Peter hath spoken through Leo."

The supreme authority of Leo was further manifested in his signing the Canons. The Canons he signed became the law of the Catholic Church, and the 28th Canon which he refused to sign, never became the law of this Council.

It has the more important bearing on this sub-

ject that these four Councils were held in the East and the members were nearly all Orientals. The Papacy is then part of the contents of Christianity, and if the Pope were to disappear out of Christianity today, Christianity would follow him tomorrow.

Englishmen have regarded Gregory as an authority on faith. And since England separated from the See of Gregory in the 16th century, Englishmen have been doubting and denying that Peter was the Chief of the Apostles, although believing in these four Councils, and although Gregory asks, "Who is ignorant that the Church is established on the firmness of the Chief of the Apostles?" Who? Shall Americans answer and say that England, which for 1000 years was asserting that Peter was Chief, is now alas! ignorant of the fact; or that Englishmen, knowing the fact, are sinning against the light?

Whatever then was believed as of faith by the Church universal at any time must be true, but the Supremacy or headship of the successor of Peter was thus believed, and therefore it must be true. And if true in any age, it is true today.

As to the first part of the proposition, Englishmen admit that the dogmas of General Councils; or the official pronouncements of the Church; or the consensus of the faithful; or the belief of the *Ecclesia dispersa,* must be truth.

And the truth of the other part of the proposition, namely, that the Supremacy or Headship of the successor of Peter was thus believed in, is evident from the foregoing passages.

The Church is the mystic Body of Christ, animated by His Spirit and by the Spirit of Truth as we have seen. When, therefore, she speaks to the world on faith and morals she is evidently the mouthpiece of Jesus Christ. "He who hears you hears Me."

Hence those disrespecting the authority of the Pope ought to shudder reading these words of the Vatican Council: "If any one shall say that it is not from the institution of Christ, or by divine right, that St. Peter have perpetual successors in the Primacy over the universal Church * * * let him be anathema."

Americans see that in ecclesiastical history the Councils of the Church adown the nineteen centuries bear testimony that the Pope has the Primacy—is the Head of the Church; that his assent gives the enactments of Councils the power of law; that the Popes are appealed to for the right faith in cases of doubt; that when heresies arise the Popes arise to crush them; and that the Popes are found deposing Bishops and Patriarchs, and restoring others to their Sees. And if these be not Acts of Supremacy, then what are they?

"In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision: but faith that worketh by charity."—Gal. 5:6.

CHAPTER XIII

DO THE FATHERS BEAR TESTIMONY TO THE PAPACY?

"(Peter) Confirm thy brethren."—St. Luke 22:32.

From the mass of testimony given by the Fathers relative to Peter and his office only a few selections will be given. And first let us have the evidence of one who is the pride of every Englishman —Ven. (St.) Bede. He says, "All those who separate themselves from the unity of his faith and communion—that is of St. Peter, and of his successor, the Pope—can never be absolved from the bond of their sins nor enter the gate of the Heavenly kingdom." Terrible words are these indeed!

As Athanasius and Jerome and Chrysostom and Augustine hold a revered place in the Book of Common Prayer, let us briefly hear them. And before doing so, let us remark that St. Irenaeus calls the Roman Church the greatest, with which all others must agree by reason of its great power.

Pope Julius I., in union with the Bishops assembled in Council at Rome, A. D. 342, wrote thus to the accusers of St. Athanasius: "If Athanasius and Marcellus (Bishop of Ancyra, driven from his See by the Arians) were in fault, you ought to have written to us, that we might have pronounced sentence."

St. Athanasius (A. D. 296) and the entire Orthodox East of his day, recognized the Petrine ascendancy of the Bishop of Rome. They looked to the Pope as their leader and protector, while the Arians had recourse to Caesar. Athanasius appealed to Pope Julius for redress and got it.

St. Jerome (331) tells us that in his time the Holy See was perpetually referred to for its judgment on difficult matters pertaining to the Church abroad. "I was secretary," he says, "to Damasus, Bishop of the Roman City, and answered the synodical consultations of the East and West." (Ep. 123.) Again he writes: "My resolution is to read the ancients, to try everything, to hold fast what is good and not recede from the faith of the Catholic Church." (Ep. 119, ad Min. No. 11) " The gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I consider the gates of hell to be the vices and sins, or at least the doctrines of heretics by which, being seduced, men are led to hell." Com. in Matt. 16: 18, L. 3.)

St. John Chrysostom (344): "Peter himself the Chief of the Apostles, the first in the Church, the friend of Christ, who received a revelation not from man, but from the Father * * * this very Peter—and when I name Peter, I name that unbroken rock, that firm foundation, the great Apostle, the first of the disciples. (T. 2, Hom. 3 de Poenit., n. 4, p. 353.)

"And yet after so great an evil (his denial), He again raised him to his former honor, and entrusted to his hand the primacy over the universal Church." (T. 2, Hom. V de Poenit., n. 2, p. 366.)

"Great was God's consideration towards this city

(Antioch), as He manifested by deeds, inasmuch as he who was set over the whole habitable world; he in whose hands He placed the keys of heaven; him to whom He entrusted the doing and supporting all things, him He ordered to tarry there for a long time; thus this our city was to him equivalent to the whole world." (T. 2, In S. Ig. M. n. 4, p. 712.)

"Peter, the leader of the choir of the Apostles, the mouth of the disciples, the pillar of the Church, the buttress of the faith, the foundation of the confession, the fisherman of the universe, he who raised up our race from the depths of error even to heaven, he who was always ardent and full of confidence, etc." (T. 3, Hom. de Dec. Mill. Talent., n. 3, p. 7.)

"Why," asks Chrysostom, "did Christ shed His blood? That He might obtain possession of those very sheep, which He entrusted to Peter and his successors." (T. 1, l. 2. De Sacerd. n. 1, p. 454.)

St. Augustin (354) giving reasons why he remains in the Catholic Church, says, "The succession of priests from the very chair of the Apostle Peter,—to whom the Lord after His resurrection committed His sheep to be fed,—down even to the present bishop, keeps me, etc." (T. 8, Contr. Ep. Fund. Manich. Col. 269.)

It is plain, therefore, that the Church in communion with the See of Rome was the one that Athanasius and Jerome and Chrysostom and Augustin chose as their guide.

From the mass of Patristic evidence in favor of Peter, let the above suffice here, closing the testi-

mony of the above doctors, so prominent in the Prayer Book, with the words that St. Optatus addressed to a Donatist. "Forthwith he should be a schismatic and a sinner, who against that chair (of Peter) set up another." (St. Optat. Cont. Parm. Lib. 2, c. 6.)

To reject Peter as Vicar of Christ—as the one having the Keys of Power and Authority; to reject him endowed with the Chief Pastorate; to reject him having the power to confirm and strengthen the brethren; and to set up another, or substitute the king for him, hath no guarantee in Scripture, and is really tantamount to a new gospel, and hence deserves anathema.

When we see the unanimity of the Greek as well as the Latin Fathers—of Ignatius, Irenaeus, Optatus, of Cyril of Jerusalem and Cyril of Alexandria, of Gregory Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzus, of Basil of Caesarea and Basil of Ancyra, of Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustin and Jerome, of Leo the Great, Hilary, and others, in recognizing the spiritual supremacy of the Roman See, it must inevitably lead every reflecting mind to the conclusion, that this right and authority was universally recognized throughout the Church of Christ in the early days of Christianity. So Nampon maintains.

Well, then, has the renowned Newman declared that "all we know of Christianity in ancient history, as a concrete fact, is the Church of Athanasius and his fellow bishops: it is nothing else historically but that bundle of phenomena, that combination of claims, prerogatives and corresponding acts,

some of which I have recounted above. There is no help for it then; we cannot take as much as we please, and no more, of an institution which has a monadic existence. We must either give up the belief in the Church as a divine institution altogether, or we must recognize it at this day in that communion of which the Pope is head. With him alone, and round about him, are found the claims, the prerogatives and duties which we identify with the kingdom set up by Christ. We must take things as they are; to believe in a Church is to believe in the Pope." (*Dfficulties of Anglicans,* Vol. II, The Papal Ch. p. 207.)

"He that is unbelieving, his soul shall not be just in himself; but the just shall live in his faith."—Habac. 2:4

They delivered unto them the decrees for to keep that were decreed by the Apostles and ancients who were at Jerusalem." Acts 15:2.

CHAPTER XIV.

DID ENGLAND ONCE BELIEVE IN THE PAPACY *DE JURO DIVINO*?

"They went out from us; but they were not of us." —I John 2:19.

"Shall thine unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid."—Rom. 3:3.

"But we are not the children of withdrawing and perdition, but of faith to the saving of the soul." —Heb. 10:39.

"Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schism among you."—I Cor. 1:10.

"That henceforth you walk not as also the Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind."—Eph. 4:17.

How the Christian religion was introduced into Britain is a matter of conjecture. Beda however informs us that King Lucius applied to Pope Eleutherius between the years 177 and 181 for missionaries. (*History of the Anglo-Saxon Church.* Lingard. Vol. I., pp. 2 and 3.) Gildas says that the British bishops were regarded as connected with St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles. (*History of the Anglo-Saxon Church.* Lingard. Vol. I., p. 13.)

It is sometimes alleged, however, that St. Paul established the faith in Britain. Granted that he did. The faith that he established was Catholic faith. Four matters of Pauline doctrine observed by the Catholic clergy—the Roman Catholic clergy, namely, *celibacy, his doctrine on marriage, the*

ministry of reconciliation, and the *Real Presence in the Eucharist,* differentiate them from Non-Catholic clergy, differentiate them from Anglican clergy generally. In his Epistle to the Romans, he praises their faith (Rom. 1: 8). It is the *same as his* (Rom. 1: 12). More Roman than Peter, he dies by the sword as a Roman citizen, while Peter is crucified. Would that England were as loyal to Peter as Paul was, who was Peter's companion in death for the faith.

It is also sometimes alleged that England got the faith from Ephesus. Was it not the Bishop of Ephesus, the beloved Disciple, hearing Peter declare his love, that recorded in his gospel the wonderful perogative conferred on Peter to feed the whole flock? And was it not this evangelist's wonderful privilege to survive and *witness the exercise of this very prerogative* in the person of Clement, Peter's successor? St. John's disciples—Polycarp of Ephesus and Ignatius of Antioch—bear testimony to the importance of the Roman See. And the Great Council held at Ephesus *recognized the supremacy.* If England received the faith through Ephesus, then Englishmen pay but scanty attention to the solemn advice of St. Paul to the Ephesians regarding the unity. For Englishmen have *failed* to keep the unity of the faith. They have not been careful "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." They broke the unity of the faith and the bond of peace when they broke with the Papacy.

But whether the faith was received through

Ephesus or from St. Paul it matters not. The faith of the ancient Britons was *Catholic.* They regarded the Pope as their head; and, as their head, Lingard tells us "that Gregory had written Augustine that he had subjected *all* the Bishops of Britain to his authority." (*Lingard's His.* New Ed. Vol. 1, p. 78.)

It matters little, however, for the purpose of this Appeal how the faith originated in Britain. The Appeal is addressed to *Englishmen,* to the descendants of those *Anglo-Saxons* who received the faith, as the world knows, from St. Augustine. What we want to emphasize is this: The people of England for 800 years after Augustine's time continued to believe that the Pope is the head of the Church *ex jure divino.* If, then, in 1492 this was the national faith, and it continued to be the faith of the English people till it was destroyed amongst them by kingly power, stimulated by kingly passion, and if it was true and thus believed then, it *ought to be true and thus believed to-day.*

England accepted the General Councils from Nice in 325, declaring the Roman pontiff *always had the Primacy,* to Florence in 1439 declaring that he had the *Primacy over the whole earth;* and in accepting these declarations Englishmen accepted *truths existent before these Councils convened.*

England also accepted the minor Councils of Arles (314), Sardica (347) as well as others setting forth the Supremacy of the Holy See. So steadfast was England in this regard that it may

well be asked, "What Council setting forth the Papal Supremacy in its *strongest terms* did she *refuse to accept?*"

So also did England express her belief in the Supremacy in her *own National Councils* and *Convocations* and in the *declarations of her saintly Archbishops.*

Witness the Council of Cloveshoo (747) referring to "Gregory as the Apostle and Master of our nation," and decreeing that "nothing should be said or sung in the Churches except what is derived from Scripture and what the custom of the Roman Church permits."

Witness Chelsea (787) where Papal legates promulgated canons for the English Church, and received for the Pope the signatures of acceptance of these canons by the English prelates there assembled.

Let us listen to Bishop Peter Quivil of Exeter in his diocesan Synod, May 1287, decreeing that "it is not lawful either to teach or to hold otherwise than we see the Roman Church, the mother of all churches, follow and hold.

"Therefore, in case of doubt, *recourse should be had to the most holy Roman Church,* which by the grace of the Almighty God, having the authority of Apostolical tradition, is *proved never to have erred from the right path.*" If this, then, were the English sentiment and faith in the 13th century, what new revelation has there been to induce and authorize a change?

For the benefit of the noisy people who used to frequent Exeter Hall, London, and in face of Can-

terbury claiming to yet have Primatial rights, although rebellious to the authority that conferred these rights, let us read what King Edward, the Confessor, said with regard to Exeter: "If, however—which God forbid! any plunderer or scoffer, inflamed by the blotch of unrighteous greed, shall contemptuously presume to defraud or alter this charter, or diminish or detract from the substance of the same, let him be laid in everlasting chains with the devil and his ministers, and separated from Christ and His saints by the division of perpetual curse."

What testimony do the Archbishops of Canterbury give to the Papacy? Their testimony is in favor of our claim. Let Lanfranc speak for the rest. In 1072 he declared in his claim of supremacy over York, "The Roman Church is, as it were, the *sum of all Churches,* and *all other Churches* are, as it were, *its parts.* * * * Consequently, as Canterbury is subject to Rome because it received the faith thence, so York is subject to Canterbury which sent preachers thither." (Gee and Hardy, D. I. E. C. H., pp. 53, 54.) And we find Lanfranc and Thomas of York going together to Rome to receive the pallium.

But there were great Church quarrels in England. Certainly. There were quarrels with the Pope over money, but *none in denial of his spiritual Headship.* Englishmen grumbled over Peter Pence, but did not repudiate Peter's Primacy. There is a *vast difference* between a quarrel over *tax* and *faith.* Quarrels arose because the Pope's spiritual and temporal jurisdictions in those days

were not clearly defined. William the Conqueror refused homage to the Pope, but he was quite willing to let the above statement of Lanfranc, that Canterbury was subject to Rome, go unchallenged.

The martyrdom of Thomas á Becket shows conclusively that there were disgraceful family quarrels in England; but notwithstanding these stains on England's history, the nation was Catholic and acknowledged the Vicar of Christ. But since the Constitutions of Clarendon were the primary cause of á Becket's suffering and death the king solemnly repealed them. Lingard says that Henry II explained that these Constitutions prevented appeal to Rome in *civil* cases only. (Ling. Vol. II., p. 219.)

When at the Synod of Westminster in 1246 the Archbishop and Bishops of Canterbury complained of the Pope's oppressive exactions, they speak of the "Apostolic See," which they call their "own holy Mother," and beg the Pope to remember "the fervor of English faith, and that the same kingdom has been specially devoted to the Roman Church." (Wilkins 1, 694.) And did not Primate Arundel in 1414 with the assent of the bishops and clergy declare the belief in the Papacy as part of the Catholic faith?

But why multiply evidence. Is it not known the world over that Henry VIII, voicing the belief of the English nation, ere his family trouble arose, wrote against Luther and upheld the Papal Supremacy? And did not Convocation, just as the *Ecclesia Elizabethana* was being established, declare in 1559 its set of five leading Articles of the

English Church, one of which was the Papal Supremacy. And these Articles were subscribed to by both Universities. (Ling. Vol. VII, p. 260.)

"Has this Convocation maintaining the chief pastorate of Peter's successors in the *Church* ever been reversed by a Convocation down to the present day?" Anglicans ask in the *Prince of the Apostles*.

Enough has been said to show that belief in the Papal Supremacy was the faith in England in pre-Reformation times. If there were quarrels with the Papacy over temporal matters; or if the Pope exercised jurisdiction as a feudal lord; or if the enemies of the Papacy refused in the past few centuries to recognize the spiritual supremacy because associated with that temporal jurisdiction; surely there can be no objection to recognizing the Chief Pastorate on these grounds *today*, when he is deprived of his own temporalities, exercises no temporal jurisdiction over other nations, and is a mere prisoner in his own palace. Nevertheless Pius X is no less a Pope than Hildebrand. Most assuredly; for before Hildebrand, or any other pontiff exercising temporal jurisdiction in its palmiest days, the Supremacy—the Chief Pastorate—existed; for it does not follow from any temporal power or jurisdiction, but is grounded in the very Gospels themselves.

A book, remarkable in many ways, is *The Prince of the Apostles* written by two Anglican clergymen. We quote largely from it in this chapter, hoping that the testimony of Anglicans and Protestants will be acceptable to their class. (Since

the book was written one of them has joined the Church. See p. 181.) In it they have conclusively proved that "an Ecclesia Anglicana not in conscious dependence upon the Holy See in spirituals is a phenomenon unknown to history before the reign of Henry VIII." How were the English people deprived of their faith in this matter? Henry and Thomas Cromwell, Elizabeth and Cecil did the work. It has been well said that "the child of Anne Boleyn clinched the nail that her father drove into the casket of the liberties of the English Church." Elizabeth was bound to down that Church in England that declared her illegitimate, and she succeeded. She continued the policy of separation from the center of Christian unity—that dire policy initiated by her father through most unworthy motives.

Is it, then, true that the Papacy was part of the Englishman's faith for the most glorious period in his history? *Yes, absolutely true.* Is it true also that Henry VIII destroyed this faith amongst his subjects and established his own supremacy in spirituals by the axe, the gibbet, the stake and the laws of praemunire and forfeiture? *Yes, absolutely true.*

That Henry is to be held accountable for this destruction of England's faith is proved conclusively by England's historian in this our day. Dr. James Gairdner, in his book, *The English Church from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary,* has made it clear that the Reformation was not the work of the English nation as a nation. * * * This fact is proved by repeated in-

surrections of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land, indignant uprisings of an oppressed nation. * * * Given a leader for the people the Reformation would never have happened. * * * Papal Supremacy the English nation, as a nation, never sought to cast off. * * * The king substituted himself for the Pope, the Spiritual Head, wholly and solely because the Holy See would not violate the moral law and give him a dispensation for either bigamy or divorce.

"The nobility bribed by Church property, were interested to maintain the revolution. The House of Commons was packed and then brow beaten. If the people resisted, the king 'butchered' them. If they tried to give expression to their grievances, he gagged them. Whosoever refused to perjure his soul by swearing to the king's spiritual supremacy Henry 'brutally despatched.' Such for example were Prior Houghton and his saintly Carthusians, 'on whom the dreadful sentence was carried out with even more than usual brutality, for they were ripped up in each other's presence, their arms torn off and their hearts rubbed upon their mouths and faces.' By such sweet methods did Bluff King Hal dethrone the Pope in the hearts of the English people." (*The Prince of the Apostles, p.* 169.) This is a review of historical facts recorded by Dr. Gairdner, Anglican though he be. Are these statements of this eminent historian true? If so, Americans must condemn such means and methods of depriving people of their faith. And the conclusion must necessarily be reached that this new, manipulated faith introduced into the

Colonies is utterly devoid of indications of heavenly interposition and sanction.

But the object of this Appeal is not so much to investigate how this faith—this belief in the Papal Supremacy then prevalent, was lost, as how it can be *restored.* Whether lost through individual repudiation or kingly interference with the rights of conscience, the fact is there, that what was formerly accepted as divine faith is now rejected. The English people are a proud people, and Americans have sympathy for a people ruthlessly reduced to the condition of prodigals; and hope to see Englishmen soon regain their long-lost rights and belief in this regard.

"I have spread forth My hands all the day to an unbelieving people, who walk in a way that is not good after their own thoughts."— Is. 65:2.

"These things speak, and exhort and rebuke with all authority."—Titus 2:15.

CHAPTER XV.

LET US GET TOGETHER.

"Then saith the Lord: Stand ye on the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it: and you shall find refreshment for your souls."—Jer. 6:16.

"Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind laboring together for the faith of the gospel."—Philip 1:27.

"That they all may be one, . . . that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."—St. John 17:21.

We have seen that the Council of Florence (1442) declared that "the Roman Pontiff held the Primacy over the whole world;" and that even before this in 1414 England specially declared through its Primate Arundel that the Primacy was of faith. If of faith then, 'tis of faith today. And moreover these expressions of the Catholic world, and of England particularly, were used at a period of great internal trouble and strife for the Church herself.

Separated from the Church—the Catholic Church—the *Ecclesia Elizabethana* is a failure in every respect. She is nominally a Church, but in reality a department of the State. Caesarism is too much in evidence for her to be regarded as the Gospel Church. Parliament makes her laws. English newspapers, every week, tell the world of the division of her Hierarchy on matters of doctrine or discipline, to the distraction of her followers. She has not maintained in the past, and

she does not, and cannot maintain in our day, the scriptural unity of the faith. An eminent English historian designated her "the mother of sects." Her dissenters outnumber her adherents. She is not ten per cent. of the population of England. And in this country she is not 2 per cent of the population, although she got such a good start, backed up though she was, by power and wealth. Abroad what nation has she converted in the past 400 years? Not even India, under her influence since the days of Clive and Hastings. A Church showing such poor results ought to step down and out as a national and missionary Church. Nor should anyone seek to have *her* the standard of Reunion, around which others should rally.

The Orientals crushed beneath the heel of the unspeakable Turk also show very poor results. What have they done for the past 1000 years to convert Asia? Separated from Rome, they have seemed to be paralyzed. Are these facts that cannot be controverted? Americans think so. Let the truth be known.

Why cannot Catholic, Anglican and Greek unite to convert that trinity of nations—India, China and Japan? The far East is awakening. Now while we are at peace with the Orient, ere its passions and prejudices be aroused by another war, is the time to make the supreme effort to Christianize it. But ere this heavenly work be done, this triune Christian force must bear upon itself the heavenly impress of unity. Ere the pagan will be convinced of the necessity of unity in the faith, the Christians themselves *must afford the example.*

If faith is so necessary, if a *partial faith* is not sufficient, if the doctrine of Christ is so essential, if the Gospel must be listened to on penalty of damnation, how then are the masses, with minds poisoned against the Church that has the complete faith, to get rectified? Only the Gospel Church has the correct and complete faith. The Church, therefore, with the Gospel marks on it, must be sought in spite of all obstacles and prejudice. This Church must have *unity of faith;* must have *sanctity* in its founder, its doctrine, and its means of sanctification called Sacraments; it must be characterized by *universality* as to doctrine, time, and place; and must have *Apostolic* origin back even unto the days of Christ Himself. No Church devoid of all these signs is the *saving* Church—the Church of the Saviour. And we will be pardoned for saying right here, that Americans see that no Church has these characteristics of the Gospel Church, except the one with headquarters in Rome.

Let us then get together. The Elizabethan Church is either the successor of the pre-Reformation English Church, or she is non-Catholic.

Now here is the difficulty. The Catholic Church of today which is *identified* with the Catholic Church in England in 1492—the Church Government with headquarters at Rome, tells the world that the Anglican Church has no such succession; and points out the various discrepancies in Creed, Worship, Discipline and Government that exist between them. Oh, no! it is mere *insanity* to maintain that the Anglican Church—the *Ecclesia Eliz-*

abethana—the Church established by law in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, has the succession of the Pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England.

And if she be non-Catholic she has no church authority whatsoever. Where could she get it?

The National Church of England *cannot maintain unity* within her own ranks, nor amongst dissenting Englishmen. Her own ranks are divided into High, Low and Broad; and Dissenters disregard her authority. And if the National Church cannot maintain unity of faith amongst its own members, and cannot command obedience amongst Englishmen generally, how could it maintain unity or command obedience amongst Christians of the world at large—amongst Christians of all other tribes and tongues and nations? Now, then, if *unity is imperative,* let us have recourse to her that keeps her scattered millions as *one;* if *fullness of faith is requisite,* let us adopt the teaching of her who is the sole depositary and guardian of the faith, and who has lost *none* of its truths; if it is *necessary* to belong to the *Mystical Body of Christ,* let us become members of that Church which *is* His Mystical Body; if the *Channels of Grace,* called Sacraments, *are salutary,* let us go to her that is the *dispenser*; if it is *needful, and consoling* and *advantageous* to *listen* to the Teacher. let us go with humility and docility to her, that is the *divinely appointed Teacher,* and thus hear *with a certainty* "Thus saith the Lord."

"Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ."—I Cor. 5:15.

"Fight the good fight of faith: lay hold on Eternal Life whereunto thou art called."—I Tim. 6:12.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE CHRISTIAN GOVERNMENT.

"If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."—St. Matt. 18:17.

"And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: . . . it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city."—St. Matt. 10:14, 15.

"And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matt. 28:18, 20.

"He that shall deny Me before men, shall be denied before the Angels of God."—St. Luke 12:9.

"Whosoever revolteth, and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God."—2 John 1:9.

"And as they (Paul and Timothy) passed through the cities, they delivered unto them the decrees for to keep, that were decreed by the Apostles and Ancients who were at Jerusalem."—Acts 16:4.

"Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God."—Acts 20:28.

The English government, or the United States government, knows best the rights, privileges and principles on which its government is established. So also the Christian government—the Catholic Church, the Church of the ages, the Apostolic Church, the Church founded by St. Peter, identified with Peter, the Church whose head, the Bishop of Rome, has always held the Primacy, as Nice declared, and which succeeding Councils have de-

clared adown the ages to our own day—she knows best the rights and privileges and principles on which she is established by Christ. No assailant can deprive her of them.

And as the English government is the best expounder of the principles on which she is founded, the most accurate and authentic interpreter of her laws, so the Church government is the best interpreter of her laws and principles. Once we get a correct idea of this Church government, the official interpreter of all Christian revelation, guaranteed against error, we have the *greatest peace and consolation and confidence,* for we *never stop then to question the accuracy of her teaching.* She has the words of eternal life. Hell's gates shall never prevail against her.

A nation may enact laws and explain them, but it also has authority to look after their observance. The Church has authority to see that the faithful "*observe* whatsoever Christ commanded." And He who gave this authority, is He not "King of kings and Lord of lords?" Is it not He to whom all power in heaven and on earth belong? Peter received from Him charge of all the flock—all the faithful, in order to uphold the faith and confirm the brethren. He is to feed and rule them. He has the keys of the Kingdom—symbolic of supreme power, as the crown and scepter are with us. And the Christian government must not, will not fade from the world.

Pope St. Siricius (A. D. 385) writes: "We carry the burden of all who are laden, or rather the blessed apostle Peter beareth them in us, who,

we believe, protects and defends in all things us who are the heirs of his government." (Coustant, Ep. Pont., p. 664.)

Pope Gregory the Great writes to John the Faster "that he succeeded to the government of the Church." (Gregory Ep. XVIII. ad Joan.)

And this authority does the Pope continue to possess in its fulness.

What Does the Church Define About Her Authority?

The Vatican Council declares: "All, both pastors and faithful, are bound to render him true obedience, not only in things concerning faith and morals, but also in things relating to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the entire globe. So that, unity being preserved with the Roman Pontiff, as well of communion as of the profession of the same faith, the Church of Christ may be one flock under one pastor. This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation."

"If anyone, therefore, shall say that the office of the Roman Pontiff has only the office of inspection or direction, but not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in the things that pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the discipline and government of the Church diffused throughout the whole world, or that he has only the more important place but not the whole plenitude of the supreme power, or that this, his power, is not ordi-

nary and immediate, whether over all and each of the churches, or over all and each of the pastors and faithful, let him be anathema!"

When, therefore, the Christian government declares that its Head is to be thus obeyed, and reminds us that he has plenitude of power in the government, Christians ought surely to submit. St. Peter tells us to be subject to lawful authority. "Whether it be the king, as excelling, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil doers * * * for such is the will of God." (Peter 2:13-15.) And St. Paul says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher power, for there is no government but from God, and those that are ordained of God." "Therefore he that resisteth power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist purchase unto themselves damnation." (Rom. 13:1-2.)

If, therefore, resisting a lawful human government be damnation, what are we to say of *Englishmen who are resisting the divine government,* the government divinely established? Is it not to be regarded as resisting Him who said: "All power is given Me in heaven and on earth, as the Father sent Me, I also send you." ?

* * *

Not only is it the office of the Christian government to explain its principles and to make laws grounded on those principles, but it is also its office to receive and decide appeals. We Americans have great respect for the decision of our government through its supreme court, even though during the past century some mistakes, glaring

mistakes, can be pointed out. It is not contended that it never makes a mistake, and yet we have the greatest confidence in our supreme court. Now the Christian government claims she does not make mistakes in matters of faith and morals, so that no wrong matter in Appeals or in insidious heresy was ever inscribed in her Creed. She points not to *one hundred* years alone, but to *over eighteen hundred* years, she has stood between ages of the greatest trouble and perplexity, *but was never betrayed into an error of faith.* Surely, this ought to give Englishmen, yea, the *entire world* besides, the greatest confidence in her teaching and pronouncements.

She is not afraid of history. She even throws open the sacred treasures of the Vatican archives to the scholars of the world. She invites investigation. She maintains that no doctrine of the early Church has ever been cancelled; that no dogmatic declaration of one General Council is contradicted by another; that there has been no wrong decision on appeal affecting the whole Church, and that there has been no erroneous ex-cathedra statement.

In the figurative sense the key is an emblem of government and power.—Isa. 22:22.

It also signifies the gift and ability to interpret the Scripture whereby an entrance is made to the knowledge thereof.—St. Luke 11:52.

These two significations are embodied in the wonderful words of Christ to Simon.—St. Matt. 16:19—wherein He refers to the whole administration of the Gospel, with reference both to the publication of its doctrine, and the dispensing the

ordinances of it. "Upon this rock I will build My church, and I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." By giving the keys He gives to Peter the government of the kingdom of God upon earth—the Church and the necessary knowledge to explain the doctrine of that kingdom when speaking ex-Cathedra.

If then England generally conceded in 1492, and for hundreds of years before, that the Roman Church, the *Catholic Church, with headquarters at Rome, was the Church of the Bible;* and if Englishmen know full well that this same ancient Church exercises the same august functions at the same headquarters, should you not shudder, lest its anathemas, hurled at heresy and disobedience, might affect you? *"Who can dwell forever in devouring flames?"* And is not this the unhappy lot of those who die in heresy and schism? Certainly those who die in willful heresy and schism invite the terrible penalty of "perishing everlastingly." (Athanasian Creed.)

"If there be any virtue, if any praise of discipline, think on these things."—Phil. 4:8.

"And how shall they preach unless they be sent?"—Rom. 10:15.

"He that shall rise up to rule the Gentiles, in Him the Gentiles shall hope."—Rom. 15. 12.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ORIENT IS AWAKENING.

"And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light and kings in the brightness of thy rising"—Is. 60:3.

"And this gospel of the kingdom, shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations."
—St. Matt. 24:14.

There is no one professing Christianity, no one with the love of God and his neighbor in his breast, no one having the interests of the Redeemer at heart, but must see it is a reproach to our twentieth century Christianity to have the great nations of the Rising Sun still in the darkness of paganism.

The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* notes a remarkable and gratifying tribute to the work of Catholic missionaries paid by the late Sir Robert Hart, long resident in China as an honored and reliable official. This veteran diplomatist, who was not a Catholic, speaking at the Leeds Missionary Exhibition, of his fifty-four years' experience in China, said that among the Catholic missionaries are to be found "the most devoted and self-sacrificing of Christ's followers. The Roman Catholic missions," added he, "have done great work in spreading the knowledge of our God and our Saviour, and more especially in their self-sacrifice in the cause of deserted children and afflicted adults. Their organization as a society is far ahead of any

other, and they are second to none in zeal and self-sacrifice personally."

Would that England would lay aside her unchristian qualities of envy, hatred and disobedience, and co-operate with this "principal, zealous, self-sacrificing organization." If she but would, the Chinese idols would be turned into statues of Christian heroes, as the statue of Jupiter was turned into the bronze statue of St. Peter in the Vatican. If the Mikado send to King George for Christian missionaries, will the latter despatch missionaries to take to Japan the same faith that converted the cruel Anglo-Saxon warrior in the days of Athelstan? For what was once *good enough for England* ought to be *good enough for Japan,* especially as better is not revealed.

If another Columbanus start for China from an Irish monastery, bringing the same faith that converted Europeans, whether would the treasury of the British Missionary Society be with him, or against him? If an English Boniface go to Japan, taking with him the faith that softened the Germanic heart, will England give him her moral and practical support? If Rome send another Augustine to the tribes on the Ganges, would England be ready to facilitate his mission? Very well then, but how? As these Apostles did not conquer with the material sword, but with "the sword of the spirit," which is the word of God, so also these new apostles do not need material weapons. How, then, is England going to give this great help? *Principally by submitting herself anew to this Gospel Church, identified with the Papacy*

from Peter to Pius. As matters now are, the Orient can point out that England herself is not "hearing", but is *a rebel to Church authority and to Church government*, and in need of being converted anew.

Suppose the Mikado should ask not the Pope but the President of the United States, to send missionaries. What then? According to the latest census we have 125 Christian sects in this country. Suppose a delegate from each, provided with credentials showing the name of his church, the date of its institution, and its creed, would go. The emperor might reasonably object to introduce into his empire a religion that would divide his people into 125 hostile camps. And having heard the delegates, he might advise them to return home and *first settle their own differences* and when agreed as to what Christianity teaches, then come. He might, however, first require a settlement of the question, "Was there ever such a person as Christ, and what did He say?" Evidently the Ecclesia Elizabethana and all Protestant sects must remain silent while the question is discussed. They are not witnesses—no, not a single one of them—since Protestantism started only in 1517. A witness is one that sees and hears. Well then, the Church — the Catholic Church — both saw and heard Christ, and received His message and commission to communicate it, and to be His witnesses. Should, therefore, the Mikado send to Pius for missionaries, the Head of the Church will send him ones that will bring this gospel truth—the *unity of faith—and not* 125 *conflicting opinions on that one faith.*

CHAPTER XVIII.

GET READY NOW FOR UNITED ACTION.

"And you shall be witnesses unto me, . . . even to the uttermost parts of the earth."—Acts. 1:8.

"And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father hath sent His Son to be the Saviour of the World."—I John 4:14.

"For He that made thee shall rule over thee, the Lord of Hosts is His name, and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, shall be called the God of all the earth."—Is. 54:5.

"By this shall all men know that you are My Disciples, if you have love one for another."—St. John 13:35.

The Christian situation in England is most uninviting for the Mikado, or any other pagan prince. What with Catholics agitating against the cruel, unnatural, unchristian laws inflicted on them through the influence of the State Church, and what with non-Conformists that will not conform to her, England is today in almost as convulsive a condition in religious matters as the daylight-robber nation across the Channel under its Jewish, Socialistic, Infidelistic regime. When two prominent Christianized governments, side by side, thus treat the "living Church of the living God," why should pagan governments respect her? Why should England *pretend* to teach any pagan nation *first century* Catholic doctrine, when she is listed among the nations as a Protestant nation—a nation of *sixteenth century religion?* Why were her sovereigns, for the past few centuries compelled to take a coronation oath which was a *crowning infamy;* which *broke* with old England of pre-Ref-

ormation days, and *stigmatized* as idolators, men who are the glory of England, such as Alfred the Great, Edward the Confessor, Richard Coeur de Lion, St. Anselm and St. Thomas? Why should England try to *give to other nations* the scriptural unity of faith when she *has lost it herself?* Why should pagans accept Christianity when expressions such as these prevail amongst Christians: "It is no matter what you believe provided you do what is right;" "One religion is as good as another."? And, if so, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Shintoism is, forsooth, as good as Christianity. Why should pagans accept Christianity when Church authority, that supplies this Christianity, is rejected by Christians themselves? Why should pagans accept the New Testament when the Church authority that supplies this Scripture is discarded?

It is cruel irony that the "United" Kingdom is most "disunited" religiously; and curiously enough this disunion is largely due to the tactics of a former ruler of England, who, expecting obedience from others, set at naught the obedience required of himself on divine authority. If Henry VIII., voicing England's faith, were right in believing in the Pope's Supremacy in spiritual matters, in believing him to be the Vicar of Christ, ere he got the idea of divorce, and in believing it with divine faith, it *must be believed with divine faith to-day.*

If Henry believed in Seven Sacraments as matters of divine faith when he wrote against Luther, and if this belief were truly divine faith then, it is so to-day, unless there be a divine revelation

telling that this belief must be changed. And such a revelation, clear and certain, and its date, are *nowhere recorded* in English history.

So, also, if Luther, before 1517, believed in the Pope's Supremacy and in Seven Sacraments, and believed these as matters of divine faith, and on Church authority, and if they were certainly matters of divine faith then, *they are so to-day.* A mere attack on Church authority does not warrant its destruction. People have an absolute right to have absolute proof that Henry or Luther had divine authority—a new revelation from heaven to start a new religion, or church, in *opposition to the Gospel Church*—the Church identified with Peter and Peter's successors—the Church known as the Catholic Church and existing in England when Columbus discovered this country. And there is, of course, no proof of such revelation in England's history or in Luther's life. There is, on the contrary, an account of what Satan suggested to Luther, given by Luther himself, but we, knowing the evil that befell humanity because of the tempter's suggestions to Eve, will not accept as from God these suggestions to this man. "What sign dost thou show?" (John 6:30) was asked by the doubting Jews of old of the Master. And when Luther was asked for a sign from heaven, asked to give a proof of his mission to reform the Church by trying to overthrow its government and trying to destroy the Papacy, he answered in epithets so vile that they cannot be printed here. If, then, these matters of faith—belief in the Supremacy of the Vicar of Christ and in the Seven Sacra-

ments as being instituted by our Saviour, were true four hundred years ago, they are true today. So Americans think, yes, so should the entire world think. Human depravity is not divine revelation. Neither Henry's sword nor Luther's swaggering can make true, false; or right, wrong.

And strange to say, the world saw on the occasion of the late golden jubilee of the Vicar of Christ delegates from all the nations of the earth offering him their congratulations, robbed and prisoner though he be. And, prominent amongst these national delegates were those from England and Germany. Pius X. has significantly adopted the motto "to restore all things to Christ," and if Church authority thus once existed, or rather was once fully recognized in Anglican and Lutheran antecedents, let Anglicans and Lutherans *earnestly co-operate* with one another to have it *fully restored* amongst them.

Would that we could say to you who are in Schism: "You are no more strangers and foreigners: but you are fellow-citizens with the Saints and domestics of God."—Eph. 2:19.

"Take heed, brethren, lest perhaps there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, to depart from the living God. But exhort one another every day that none of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."—Heb. 3:12,13.

"By what authority dost Thou these things and who hath given Thee authority?"—St. Matt. 21:23.

"O praise the Lord, all ye nations; praise Him all ye people. For His mercy is confirmed upon us: and the truth of the Lord remaineth forever."—Ps. 116.

CHAPTER XIX.

TIME FOR THE ENGLISH SCHISM AND ITS CONSEQUENT PROTESTANTISM TO BE HEALED.

"And let the peace of Christ rejoice in your hearts, wherein also you are called in one body."—Col. 3:15.

"The branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it abide in the vine."—St. John 15:4.

"My perfect one is but one."—Cant. 6:8.

"Other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd."—St. John 10:16.

"Let that which you have heard from the beginning abide in you."—1 John 2:24.

"How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation: which having begun to be declared by the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him."
—Heb. 2:3.

"And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—St. John 8:32.

"I did not send prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied."—Jer. 23:21.

"We have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith in all nations for His name."—Rom. 1:5.

"For the sake of the truth, which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us forever."—2 John 1:2.

"For Christ therefore, we are ambassadors. God as it were, exhorting by us."—2 Cor. 5:20.

"He that heareth you heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me."—St. Luke 10:16.

(For Britannia, hitherto so abusive of the Church, let the prayer ascend, "Oh God! I beseech Thee, heal her."—Num. 12:13.)

Christ established a Church, a visible organization of men, to teach true doctrine, to administer the Sacraments. This divine institution with men and for men, had as a head, the man who made the

wonderful confession. Christ changed his name to Peter, to designate his office in the organization. He conferred on him the symbol of supreme power. England heartily received this faith that taught the supreme power of Peter in the organization or Church. The most glorious of its clergy and kings professed their belief in this doctrine for centuries. One of its own kings voiced this belief of the nation. In an evil hour Henry surrendered that doctrine he had lately defended. His reason for so doing is so humiliating that allusion to it is considered an offence. His "reformation" was continued by Elizabeth. The result is that the faith once delivered to the apostles is corrupted, and divided in a most deplorable and damnable manner, not only in England, but in this country, her former possession. Schism, heresy and a multiplicity of faiths prevail. And this in opposition to Sacred Scripture and the wish of the Redeemer. This is treason and disloyalty to that Church or Christian government He established. And while it is not of this world yet is in the world. "A city placed on a mountain," resplendent with the light of God's truth adown the ages.

TO WHOM IS THIS APPEAL SPECIALLY ADDRESSED?

In the first place this appeal is addressed to King George V., reported to be favorable to spiritual authority. As it was principally the sovereign that separated Englishmen from the Catholic Church, which they considered the Gospel Church, and made himself head of the new organ-

ization, so let George, happily reigning, use his good offices to undo the harm by restoring England to the Church, thus healing the schism and so far restoring unity. Neither do we ask this through diplomacy but through conscience. For if schism be sinful and it be largely the king's doing, then kingly accountability is evident to the world. And if the king do not help reunion for love of his own subjects let him graciously do so for the benefit of other English-speaking people, who are spiritually injured and aggrieved.

Appeal is made to the Right Reverend Archbishops of Canterbury and York, whose Sees were erected by papal favor.

Also to their Suffragans,—the Most Reverend Bishops,—their Clergy and Laity, to loyally promote the dying wishes of the Redeemer.

Appeal is specially made to Lord Halifax and his devoted Church Union, whose noble and sterling words in favor of Catholicity must be appreciated by all lovers of God's word and promoters of Church unity.

Appeal is made to non-Conformist clergy and people to place no obstacle to the re-establishment of Church unity, for instead of asking non-Catholics to give up whatever true doctrine or divine faith they may possess, they will, when reunited to the Apostolic See, be getting more than they now enjoy.

Appeal is made to the Protestant Church Association to cease causing diversity of faith, as such is *diametrically opposed* to Spiritual unity and to the

wish of the Saviour. The members ought to conform to Christ's plan and listen to His authorized teacher. They should never forget that every one who rejects the Church, and takes his religion from the Bible, has a religion of his own, and an *incorrect one,* as it must necessarily be.

Appeal is made to all English Statesmen, Professional men and Editors to do their utmost to effect "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

Appeal is made to the Catholic Hierarchy, Clergy and Laity, and especially to those whom current history shows to be the most active and valiant defenders of the faith, to redouble their friendly efforts by prayer, voice and pen for the return of their countrymen to the Church.

Appeal in fine is made to the people of Great Britain, from John O'Groat's to Land's End to carefully and prayerfully meditate on these words of St. Cyprian, the martyr: "Whosoever he be and whatsoever he be, he is no Christian who is not in Christ's Church (that is, the Catholic Church)." (Cyp. Ep. 1, ad Ant., p. 156.) And again: "He who forsakes the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church is built, let him not feel confidence that he is in the Church of Christ." (De Unit. Eccl., p. 195. Edit. Baluzii.)

An appeal arises in your midst from ruined shrine and fane and monastic cell for restoration of the ancient, undying faith, the *pride* and *glory* of Old England. For giving up the papacy that Aidan, and Anselm, and Cuthbert, and Thomas,

and the host of English saints maintained *de fide*, you are separated from what is best and purest in doctrine.

ENGLISHMEN OUGHT TO IMITATE ST. PAUL.

St. Paul says noble things in his Epistles. His writings are admired for the sublimity of his doctrine as well as the sincerity of his sentiments. His works are in accord with his words. Read in 2 Cor., Chap. 11, what he underwent for the cause. And yet perhaps the noblest and manliest sentence he ever penned was: "I am unworthy to be called an apostle because I persecuted the Church of God" (1 Cor. 15:9.) And we would fain hear Englishmen using a similar expression after the Penal Days. See what England did to the Sister Isle for three hundred years. During that dismal period Erin's history was written in tears and blood. But as St. Paul, who aided in the death of Stephen, is now with him in heaven, so the descendants of those who put English and Irish martyrs to death ought to repent and become reconciled to the descendants of those whom they persecuted, in the hope of gaining hereafter the blessed Christian inheritance.

And if Englishmen should imitate St. Paul in this noble confession, let them also try like him to bring true doctrine to the world. Schism from his Church, and heresy and disunion in the faith that he characterized as ONE, must be corrected amongst Christians; and the unchristian, unnatural crime of divorce—the *cancer of society*—the *blight of the home*—must be stamped out.

Then look at Asia, with its wonderful history, that has to be Christianized. And Africa, a land of natural loveliness, in religious gloom. These Continents appeal to Christians for light and knowledge, and still Christians, in hostile camps, are engaged in ignoble and unchristian strife. The cause of the Master, as well as that of humanity, is suffering from our long divisions and dissensions in matters of religion.

IT IS TIME FOR ENGLAND TO RETURN TO THE UNITY OF FAITH.

It is time then for the National Apostacy to cease.

Time for this Three Century Schism to be completely healed.

Time for England to cease repudiating her own mother, her instructress and evangelist.

Time for the prodigal daughter to return to her mother's house.

Time for England to reunite herself to the Holy See.

Time to be re-affiliated with the Western Patriarchate.

Time to be associated with the ancient Fathers.

Time for alliance with hell attacking the Church to be severed.

Time to stop this guerrilla warfare on the true fold—"the holy gathering."

Time to cease trying to dynamite the Rock established by Christ.

Time to cease attacking the Gibraltar of the Papacy.

Time, after three centuries of warfare, for Englishmen to do their utmost to repair the wreckage caused by being dashed against the Rock. It is a hopeful sign to see so many Englishmen engaged in repairing the folly of their ancestors.

Time for the mutineers to return to their ship—the barque of Peter.

Time to have three centuries of Puritanical hate completely cease.

Time to have the scales fall from Britannia's eyes, so that she may see that the branch separated from the trunk gets no sap; that the limb severed from the body is putrefying.

Time to re-profess "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Time to return to the true fold.

Time to have the famishing sheep fed by the Chief Pastor.

Time for Christians to reunite to Christianize the pagan.

Time to co-operate in removing the perverse, stubborn, obstinate resistance to the success of Christ's prayer.

Time to work earnestly in promoting the God-like work of unity in Christendom.

Time to cease opposing God's will.

Time to realize that "whoever is not with Christ is against Him."

Time "to restore all things in Christ."

Time after "the three days separation" to have Mary, who gave us Jesus, he again recognized in the land which was formerly her "dowry."

Time to have confessionals replace those destroyed, so that the clergy "ordered" to forgive sin may exercise the divinely delegated power.

Time, in fine, to have the Eucharistic God—the joy and glory of Old England—once more receive the national praise which is His due.

* * *

The signs of the times are favorable. The Greek Patriarch of the Oriental schismatics favors Reunion, considering "reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople as his grandest and most attractive dream." *The Churchman,* London, concedes the Papacy for the sake of unity. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York are reported to be favorable to the prayer and policy of the Saviour that there "be one fold and one Shepherd." The clergy and laity of the Society of St. Thomas in communion with Canterbury and York, writing to Pius X on the occasion of his golden jubilee, say that "though the deeds and misunderstandings of past years have divided you from us, we still desire to recognize in your office and dignity all that is recognized by those primitive fathers in East and West, to whom our own communion more particularly directs us for our rule of faith and conduct of life."

The feeling abroad is growing that the stray sheep should return, rebels submit to lawful authority, and Christians cease their contentions, "for God is not a God of dissension but of peace." (I Cor. 14:33.)

The spectacle would, indeed, be inspiring if England, that formerly gave such an *awful exam-*

ple by rending Christendom, should now exert herself to promote the Master's prayer that there be "one fold and one Shepherd."

Who then will God raise up, with purity of heart and nobility of soul, to lead their countrymen back to the unity of the faith?

Englishmen invited to return by Pius X and his predecessor should comply. Gladstone, in the chapel close by Buckingham Palace Road, refused to comply with Manning's "Come," and died outside.

This appeal is made to every Englishman to do his best, from this very hour, for the fulfillment of the wish and prayer of the Redeemer for unity amongst those claiming to be His followers, as well for their own good as the more readily to effect the conversion of the heathen, and thus hasten the day of fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah and the recommendation of Paul "that every knee shall bow and that every tongue shall confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father. In the Lord are my justices and empire; they shall come to Him, and all that resist Him shall be confounded." (Isa. 45:25; Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:10-11.)

* * *

Let England now arise from her Apostasy and work for unity in the distracted realm of Christendom, and thus have these words of old applied to her:—

"They shall give glory to the Lord, and shall declare His praise in the islands."—Is. 42:12.

"Be mindful from whence thou art fallen: and do penance, and do the first works."—Apoc. 2:5.

"For it had been better for them not to have known the way of justice, than after they have known it, to turn back from that holy Commandment which was delivered to them."—II Pet. 2:21.

"Thine own wickedness shall reprove thee, and thy apostasy shall rebuke thee. Know thou, and see that it is an evil and a bitter thing for thee, to have left the Lord thy God, and that My fear is not with thee, saith the Lord the God of Hosts."—Jer. 2:19.

"Thine, O Lord, is magnificence, and power, and glory, and victory: and to Thee is power; for all that is in Heaven, and in earth, is Thine: Thine is the Kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art above all Princes. Thine are riches, and Thine is glory; Thou hast dominion over all, in Thy hand is power and might: in Thy hand greatness, and the empire of all things."—1. Para. 29:11-12.

For Annotations and Corroborations substantiating statements made in this Appeal, see Part II.

A Brief American Review

OF

English Ecclesiastical History

BEFORE A. D. 1492 AND SINCE.

Being a Synopsis
From
"The Appeal to Anglicans and Others
to Return to the Unity of the Faith."

(The most appropriate place for this Synopsis would be at the end of Part II; but for uniformity's sake we place it here as Chapter XX.)

CHAPTER XX.

PROPOSITIONS.

From the "Appeal for Unity in the Faith" These Five Propositions are Evident; and They May be Further Strengthened as we Proceed in This Review.

(1) That Christ established a Church.

(2) That His Church is known in history as the Catholic Church.

(3) That England (through its National Church—Ecclesia Anglicana) was part of the Catholic Church—the Roman Catholic Church, A. D. 1492.

(4) That England regarded the Catholic Church then as the Church of the Bible.

(5) And that England regarded the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter whom Christ constituted Head of the Church, or Chief Pastor of the entire flock; and hence having unqualified jurisdiction over the Church in England in spirituals.

Decisions or Conclusions Based on the "Appeal."

"Be not faithless, but believing."—John 20:27.

"Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ."—Rom. 5:1.

I. Americans see that there is only one faith laid down in the New Testament, and that all Christians must observe this one faith. If England, by violating this unity of faith, only refused to believe what she had already believed for 1000 years, she would be stultifying herself. But not content with *violating the faith,* she also bitterly *opposed her former belief*; and moreover, did all she could to *deprive others* of this same faith and belief.

That there is on the sacred page no justification of *partial* or *fragmentary faith.* The faith, the whole faith, has to be accepted in view of that text, "He that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16.) Yes, the unbeliever shall be condemned, and for what? Is it because he won't believe something hurtful to him? Oh, no! but because he will not believe these wonderful helps God has provided for him. It is, indeed, a sad comment on humanity, and must be particularly displeasing to the loving Heart of the Redeemer, that the articles of faith, denied by non-Catholics, are those containing the greatest installments of mercy and love to an ungrateful and sinful world, such as the Sacrament of the Altar and the Sacrament of Forgiveness. Also, the instituting of the Church "to teach, govern, sanctify and save all men."

II. That this national breach of unity took place in the reign of Henry VIII, but was repaired under Mary. That as the unity of faith was again broken in the reign of Elizabeth, through her influence, and continues broken; we will for sake of distinction, designate the new church established by law—the Anglican Church of the present day, as the Ecclesia Elizabethana. For although Henry is the founder of this State Church, yet as Elizabeth's Protestantism is the result of the quarrel between her father and the Pope, it will not be incorrect to call the *resultant* Church after her. Moreover, amongst England's State papers is a document, "The Device for the Alteration of Religion in the First Year of Queen Elizabeth."

That the Ecclesia Elizabethana is in a state of heresy, because she has departed from articles of faith formerly admitted by Englishmen. She has adopted in her creed *less* than what was previously believed by the whole of Christendom.

That she is in a state of schism because she is separated from all Apostolic Churches, especially from the Apostolic See of Peter; and because she has repudiated the Western Patriarch.

III. That while the introduction of Christianity into Britain is veiled in obscurity, one thing is clear—that the early British Church was in accord in creed with the Catholic world. Now the modern British Church—the Ecclesia Elizabethana, that would fain call itself the successor of, and be identified with, the ancient British Church, is not in harmony with the Catholic world in creed

and credentials. The early British Church claimed to be a *papal foundation.* Americans *cannot see* how the Ecclesia Elizabethana, founded on Royal Prerogatives, sustained by Acts of Parliament, with official seal, not of the Fisherman, but of the Lion and Unicorn, and animated with deep hostility to the Papacy, can yet be called a *Papal* foundation.

IV. That two Anglican historians, Rev. Paul James Francis, New York, and Rev. Spencer Jones, Batsford, Eng., have proved that "an Ecclesia Anglicana not in conscious dependence upon the Holy See in spirituals, is a phenomenon unknown in history before the reign of Henry VIII;" (Vide, *The Prince of the Apostles,* page 159,) and while we admit that their thesis is absolutely true, yet we assert that it is absolutely true also, that the Ecclesia Elizabethana, independent of and fiercely antagonistic to the Holy See, with the Sovereign as its Spiritual Head, is not identical with, and has not the Apostolic succession of, the pre-reformation Ecclesia Anglicana, with the Pope as its head. Unlawful occupation does not constitute lawful succession no more than does Mohammedan occupation of Chrysostom's cathedral in Constantinople constitute Christian succession.

That there is a nobleman in England, an inheritor of the ancient faith, the Duke of Norfolk (Hereditary Earl Marshal of England) who can testify for those in doubt, that the faith of his separated brethren, the Anglicans and non-Conformists, is not the same as this ancient, apostolic and

Catholic faith. To Americans however, it is clear and evident, that England is, to-day, no more an integral part of the Catholic Church which in 1492 Englishmen believed to be the gospel Church, than is the United States a part of England.

V. That separation of the Church in England, from the Apostolic See, was due to personal quarrels between the Pope and Henry VIII, and Elizabeth, rather than to matters of faith.

That Henry wished a divorce from Catherine to marry Anne Boleyn, and, not getting it from the Pope, he unlawfully divorced himself.

That in the discussion of the lawfulness of his marriage with Catherine it is admitted that the Church that made the impediment to Christian marriage can dispense it.

That Henry marrying Anne under the same impediment showed his conduct wholly unjustifiable.

That he divorced his kingdom from the Holy See because the Holy See would not divorce him from Catherine.

That he demanded Parliament to sanction his acts by unrighteous legislation, using such threats as "give me this or I will have your heads."

That he robbed and confiscated church property to spite the Pope.

That England's latest historian, Dr. James Gairdner, clearly and emphatically corroborates these statements in his book, "The English Church from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary." A review written very soon after the

appearance of the book thus sums up the author's presentation of the facts:

"The historian has made it clear that the reformation was not the work of the English nation as a nation. * * * It was not the nation that chose the Reformation, it was the court party that forced the Reformation on the nation. * * * This fact is proved by repeated insurrections of the people, throughout the length and breadth of the land, indignant uprisings of an opressed people, which Dr. Gairdner details with unsparing impartiality; in 1536 in Lincolnshire; in 1557 in Yorkshire; almost the whole north from Westmoreland to Lincolnshire; in 1548 in Cornwall; in 1549 in twenty-one counties together. Given a leader for the people the reformation would not have happened. * * * Papal supremacy the English nation, as a nation, never sought to cast off. There were indeed grumblings—it is an Englishman's birthright to grumble—but one thing is to be noted. What little was said was very far indeed from a repudiation of the actual jurisdiction of the Church and its existing head. The king substituted himself for the Pope, the Spiritual Head, wholly and solely because the Holy See would not violate the moral law and give him a dispensation 'for either bigamy or divorce.'

"The nobility, bribed by Church property, were interested to maintain the revolution. The House of Commons was packed and then brow-beaten. If the people resisted, the king 'butchered' them. If they tried to give expression to their grievances, he gagged them. Whoever refused to perjure his

soul by swearing to the king's spiritual supremacy Henry 'brutally dispatched'—Lord Chancellor Moore, Cardinal Fisher, the Earl of Kildare, and his five uncles, the Abbots of Jerevault, Fountains, Glastonbury, Reading, Colchester, Sawley, Whalley and a host of distinguished men, including Prior Houghton and his saintly Carthusians, 'on whom the dreadful sentence was carried out with even more than usual brutality, for they were ripped up in each other's presence, their arms torn off and their hearts rubbed upon their mouths and faces.' By such sweet methods did Bluff King Hal dethrone the Pope in the hearts of the English people." (*Prince of the Apostles,* p. 168.)

VI. Americans see that English history records that the youthful Edward continued the same irreligious devastation and confiscation; and that the old religion was restored in the reign of Mary.

That Elizabeth, though praying *God that the earth might open and swallow her if she were not a true Roman Catholic,* yet set up the new, the altered religion. (*Cobbett's Hist. Prot. Reform.,* paragraph 261).

That Sacred Scripture does not warrant that Acts of Parliament signed by the Sovereign should take the place of Conciliar canons signed by the Pope, which are the declarations of that church which all must "hear" on penalty of damnation.

VII. That it is improper for Anglicans to claim a participation in Christ's priesthood, when they *reject Orders* as a Christ-act or sacrament that confers this participation. Moreover, Leo XIII specifically condemned Anglican Orders.

VIII. That Convocation of English clergy in 1559, which a Protestant writer says "was the only Convocation of the age which is above suspicion of having yielded to government pressure," drew up articles declaring the belief of the Church of England in (1) the Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist; (2) Transubstantiation; (3) the Sacrifice of the Mass; (4) the Divinely appointed Supremacy of St. Peter and his Successors over the Universal Church; (5) that the authority to deal with matters of faith and discipline belonged to the pastors of the Church and not to laymen.

This declaration of the whole bench of English bishops was subscribed to by both Universities and presented to the House of Lords. (Lingard and other English historians.)

Americans see that if this declaration of Convocation and University were true and of Divine faith *then,* it must be true and of Divine faith *to-day,* and the world wide will endorse this decision.

IX. That the Church has the office of teaching one faith and giving such explanations as this teaching requires. These explanations have taken place in Councils. That as the Council of Jerusalem was composed of the faithful and the other apostles in communion with Peter—he who was authorized to feed the entire flock and confirm or strengthen the brethren; so also the next Council (that of Nice) was composed of the faithful and the bishops (successors of the other Apostles) in communion with the Pope (successor of Peter);

schismatics and heretics excluded. Likewise the last two Councils (Trent and the Vatican) were a gathering of the faithful and the bishops in communion with the Pope; schismatics and heretics excluded. And as the two first Councils are binding on all Christians, so equally so are the last two. As also indeed are the other General Councils.

X. That it is a surprise that Englishmen would accept the first four General Councils and reject the last four, especially as England already accepted one of these four (Florence, A. D. 1439), which in such clear terms sets forth the Christian doctrine regarding the supremacy of the Pope. It is humiliating on mankind to find that a nation that formerly accepted these five Councils, so clearly setting forth the Christian principle of a headship in the Church, should afterward repudiate this principle. It is consequently to be recommended that as Anglicans refuse to acknowledge the authority of the Pope as set forth in the first four Councils, they ought to eliminate these Councils from the Prayer Book.

That it is very strange that Englishmen would praise the Pope as set forth in the first four Councils, and blame those of the last four, for they are the head of the Church in both instances.

XI. That England believed in jurisdiction, temporal and spiritual. This may be learned from Article XXXVII, where amongst other things it is laid down "that the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." This looks like the culprit passing sentence on the

judge, which is not permitted in the United States. But two things should be noticed here. That the jurisdiction referred to therein, is under the heading "Civil Jurisdiction;" and also that it mentions "realm" and not church. It would be very strange, indeed, that any one would have the temerity to write for acceptance by people, no matter how callous they might be, an Article openly denying to the Bishop of Rome an authority or jurisdiction in spirituals, which England had maintained for 1000 years!

XII. But suppose this authority were openly denied and repudiated by England. Then the Bishops and Clergy in England (except in cases where they remained faithful) had no spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The first four Councils embrace histories of persons, validly ordained, yet duly deprived of jurisdiction and degraded. Witness Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, *et id genus omne*. This last mentioned was none other than Archbishop of the Patriarchal See of Alexandria.

The authority that conferred jurisdiction took it away. So also the same authority that conferred dignity and jurisdiction on Canterbury cancelled it. If Dioscorus was deprived of his jurisdiction and excommunicated as England believed, so also is the jurisdiction of the prelates of the Elizabethan Church void. The Pope dare not give the prelates in the Elizabethan Church jurisdiction. He would not give jurisdiction against himself.

And if this be true in case of valid Orders it is *a fortiori* true if Orders are *null and void,* as Leo XIII declared Anglican Orders to be.

XIII. These prelates have Crown Jurisdiction, but that is surely of no avail in the spiritual kingdom—the Kingdom of God. In 1898, Sir William Harcourt, Samuel Smith and other representative Protestants declared in Parliament and in the Press, that the Church of England is a Parliamentary Church, governed by Parliamentary Bishops, having Acts of Parliament to live upon. A mere creature of Parliament from start to finish!

Rt. Rev. George F. Seymour, late Episcopalian Bishop of Springfield, Illinois, writing in the *Daily Illinois State Register,* December 9, 1897, asserts "we have an undoubted right to inquire as to the source whence our spiritual rulers came. And the reply is, 'from the Crown of Great Britain.' " And as all Parliamentary enactments, Civil Service and all Crown authority of every kind ceased here on the memorable day of Yorktown, there is consequently no Crown Jurisdiction here any longer.

Regarding Spiritual Jurisdiction, the formal way our Lord gives "mission" is worthy of great attention. He first grounds it on the authority that He, as man, received from God the Father. "All power," He said, "is given to Me in heaven and in earth. As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you; going, therefore, teach ye all nations." (Matt. 28:18; John 20:21.)

When Canterbury became severed from Rome, where this mission or authority was centered, who could give it "mission?"

Could or would Christ give Canterbury or Constantinople or Moscow mission against His own Church? Americans say, no.

That the declaration "that the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction in the realm" evidently shows a state of Schism in England that very time (1559); and other Articles of the XXXIX show a deviation from doctrine previously accepted.

Americans, moreover, see that this declaration is nullified in England to-day. The Pope exercises jurisdiction over millions in the realm in compliance with his spiritual authority. "Great is truth and it will prevail."

XIV. That as in the Greek schism, the Supremacy was emphasized in the case of Photios and just *before* the secession; so also in the Anglican, we find Henry VIII voicing the nation's belief in the Supremacy in his celebrated defense of the Faith against Luther, and just before Henry's own schism. Nay, more, Americans see that when the old religion, the gospel Church, was restored, and as Elizabeth was ascending the throne, the bishops, braving the royal displeasure, voiced unanimously and spontaneously the faith of Old England in the Papacy. And this occurred, too, just *before* Elizabeth entered on her schism by re-establishing the State Church of her royal father. Others may have "eyes and see not," Americans rejoice that they have eyes that see.

XV. That schism is a sin which merits eternal reprobation, and that St. Paul ranks schism and heresy with the sins of murder and idolatry (Gal. 5:20, 21); and Americans sincerely hope that as Clement healed the Corinthian schism, so Pius, who wishes "to restore all things in Christ," may heal the Anglican schism, to the end that unity in faith and Christian government may prevail. It is manifest to all, moreover, that *non-conformity* has no place in the divine economy of unity.

That not only does the Sacred Scripture deprecate schism, "Mark them who make dissensions (schisms) and offenses contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them," (Rom. 16, 17) but the Fathers also abhor it. Thus, St. Ignatius, the glorious martyr, says: "The supporter of a schism has *no part* in the kingdom of God."

And St. Augustin declares, "We must hold fast to the Christian religion and to the communion of that Church which is Catholic, and is called Catholic not only by her own children, but even by all her enemies." (*Lib. de unit.* Eccles., Cap. VII, No. 12.)

XVI. That the Church is the depositary of the heavenly message, and from this depositary emanated the New Testament writings: St. Paul getting a direct revelation from the Lord. Protestants profess and believe that the Scriptures are inspired, but they refuse to believe the Pope infallible. How do they know that the New Testament is inspired? The same authority that assures them that the New Testament is inspired tells them

that the Pope is infallible in his ex-Cathedra statements, and if they believe one with such tenacity, why not the other? They believe that God inspired men to *write* the truth, but they will not believe that God assists the Pope to *teach* the truth, especially when he is the successor of him who was specially appointed *to teach the truth and confirm the brethren!* We cannot infallibly know what Christ taught without an infallible teacher. This infallible teacher is the Church, and the Pope is its mouthpiece.

Americans see that the Sacred Scriptures were deposited with the Church and not with the 16th century Revolutionists. Americans, also, see that the Church is the teacher, and that private interpretation is deprecated on the inspired page. If Catholics wrote the New Testament, as they surely did, and if the Church declared these writings as agreeing with her teachings, and true and inspired; we do not admire the rudeness of persons snatching the book from Catholics, striking them in the face with it, and declaring that they know more about what is written therein than the Catholics themselves.

XVII. That in 1492 the Catholic Church was in possession of the teachings of Christ and of her authority to teach the same, and also of His promises of co-operation; and she was moreover in possession of the Sacred Writings confirming her right in this possession. If Protestantism received any additional revelations, or authority to justify its opposition to the Church already possessing these gifts, it is time for the world to hear of it.

Americans will not tolerate one using the rights of another especially to his great injury.

XVIII. That Protestantism cannot be the basis of reunion of Christendom, for it is simply "disunion" itself. Its motto seems to be "Disunited we stand, united we fall." It is a "house divided against itself." And as, collectively, its sects cannot be the basis, neither can any one of them singly; for the members of none of its sects are in complete unison with one another even on their own creed, on account of private interpretation. Neither can the members of any one sect assert with the certitude of an oath that all its tenets are true. Besides Protestantism is a reversal of Scripture, for it would fain *teach* the Gospel teacher, it will not "hear" the authorized teacher. Protestantism is a *diversity* of faith. It can represent innumerable faiths, while Catholicism represents ONE.

XIX. That applying the test "by their fruits you shall know them," we see that since England separated from the Apostolic See, the history of Christian dissension is sad, woeful and uncharitable.

That the faith in the English-speaking world, which should be ONE, is divided into hundreds of *conflicting* sects; that schism and heresy prevail; that the life-giving Sacraments are either not administered at all or are administered by persons not duly "Ordered." That indifferentism, infidelity, and spiritual anarchy are on the increase. To these appalling facts must be added 1,000,000 divorces in the United States in 20 years, with their

subsequent adultery and unlawful offspring. Seeing this spiritual ruin, and seeing that schism and heresy and adultery are declared in Scripture to be damnable; every virtuous and reasonable person must say that the system that caused them, fostered them, and promoted them, ought to be rectified. And as England is largely accountable for these wrongs by violating Church unity, so she ought to take a leading part now in restoring it. Yes, God wills it. *God wills unity.*

XX. That Englishmen, in 1492, regarded the Church, whose headquarters are in Rome, as the Church of the Bible, and that their ancestors accepted the first seven General Councils that did not repudiate, but did wonderfully recognize the Papacy. They also accepted the Formulary of Hormisdas, a profession of faith concluding with a promise of allegiance, which was incorporated into the proceedings of the eighth General Council at Constantinople. It is reckoned that this Formulary received the signatures of at least 2500 bishops during the previous 300 years, as Father Ryder pointed out of Anglicans. It declared that "in the Apostolic See of Rome religion has always been preserved immaculate * * * and in which (See) is the perfect and true solidity of the Christian religion." We see, therefore, on the testimony of Christendom that, although the manners of some of its Pontiffs were faulty (we are not concerned with what they *did,* but with what they *taught*); yet amid human frailty *no wrong doctrine* has been inscribed in the creed of the Apostolic See. This was the belief of Englishmen voiced by their king against Luther in 1521, and

the voice of their Bishops and the two Universities in 1559. Hence, this being true, the Anglican Art. XIX stultifies Englishmen, is false and unjustifiable by true history, and sets up a claim of infallibility *greater,* if possible, than that claimed by the Mother Church.

XXI. Americans appeal to Englishmen to be *reasonable.* There is only one Heavenly Message, and only one Official or Authorized Interpreter of it. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations." *These* and their lawful successors were sent and not their enemies. Yes, *they* were sent, *and no one was sent to teach an opposing doctrine.* St. Paul says: "There are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1, 7-8.) We see, therefore, that the whole world was to be the school of these teachers, all mankind their scholars; and that England was *not reserved* for any other teacher. And Americans consider that the scholars ought to "listen" to the teacher, ought to be taught and be obedient, especially when, as in this case, they are commanded to do so under the *severest penalty.*

XXII. But some persons, voicing the turmoil and bloodshed of the past four centuries, may say, "the Catholic Church is wrong and we are right." Well, let us see. Three things, then, would have to be proved.

(1) That the Catholic Church, whose seat of government has been at Rome, has gone astray, teaches wrong doctrines, has utterly failed, and

has lost the conferred authority, and Christ's promises and co-operation.

(2) That her rights, powers, privileges and promises were transferred by Christ to the Anglican, or some other sect.

(3) And that such sect possesses the transferred rights, powers, privileges and promises today, confirmed in them by signs from heaven or miracles.

It will not avail to impeach the Church, and try to show that she has forfeited her right and authority to be the world-teacher in matters of faith. This would indeed be poor satisfaction to the impeacher and to the world at large. A sect must prove that the Magisterium of the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments were transferred to it, and that it is now guaranteed against error. This is, indeed, a mighty task; for Americans see that the other Reformation Chiefs did not recognize Luther as having heavenly authority, for they abused him and did not abide by his decision, but started churches of *their own.*

Americans, furthermore, see that it is dishonorable for any Christian to try to justify his rebellion by saying the Church apostatized, yea, it is rather *implied blasphemy*; for it is an impeachment of the omnipotence and veracity of God, as if He could not, or would not, keep His promise.

We see, however, as Christ proved He was Divine and hence the "Way, the Truth and the Life," that we may expect He will be with His Church till the end of the world. We see, therefore, how wrong and untrue was the action of those who, in

the past four centuries, would *limit His co-operation* with the Church to the first few centuries, and appeal to the Scriptures to sustain them, forgetting that nowhere in its sacred pages can such strange statement of limitation be found.

Moreover, Luther says, "the Catholics have the authentic creeds, the authentic sacraments, the authentic Christianity." So does the late Dr. Charles C. Starbuck of Amherst College, Massachusetts, who quotes Luther approvingly (*Sacred Heart Review,* Boston, 27 Mar., 1909).

XXIII. That it is indicative of the sad plight to which Anglicans are reduced when they seek reunion with the Greek schismatics. These are Secessionists. They are Secessionists from an article of faith that *they themselves* principally defined and *most loudly proclaimed.* They *emphasized* in the seven General Councils which are the basis of Eastern Orthodoxy, and in the Formula of Hormisdas, that *Peter was the head of the Church* and the *Pope was his successor,* to whom of course obedience is due. On fourteen distinct occasions have the schismatics acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, and returned to Catholic unity; but politics, prejudices, or personalities, prevented those reunions becoming permanent.

We would like to see the Greeks coming back the *fifteenth* time to stay, not exactly for their number, but for the fulfillment in their regard of the wish and prayer of the Redeemer for unity, and for the conversion of Asia; for ever since their separation from the Papacy they seem to be paralyzed.

But how can Anglicans tamper with the Nicene Creed, or cancel the "filioque" after England declaring it true for over one thousand years?

How can Anglicans, themselves in Schism *now*, seek reunion with a church that Englishmen were declaring "accursed" for 600 years?

Evidently Anglicans should first advise Greeks to remove the cause of the anathema by accepting the Papacy; and to render this advice effective, they should give the example themselves.

XXIV. That Americans see that the office of Peter, as Pastor over all, is Christ's own arrangement, as was recognized of yore in England; and that Catholics honor Peter because *Christ Himself* so much *honored him.* He confirmed his mission by wonderful miracles, raising the dead to life (Acts IX); and the very shadow of His body curing all diseases (Acts 5:15).

That the Church, the Scriptures, and the Fathers, bear testimony to the special honor conferred on Peter, commonly called his Primacy or Supremacy.

That Christ's own voice ("He that hears you hears me")—His representative to the nations—the Church of the Gospel, has proclaimed to the world that the office of Peter is *continued* in his successors, which office is commonly called the Papacy.

That the Fathers wisely explain that it was to preserve unity that the Church was founded on Peter. Thus, in particular, said St. Pacian in the third century; and we who live in the twentieth century see how true and how wise is his state-

ment. So also, seeing the schisms and the multiplicity of heresies traceable to the secession in the sixteenth century, do we admire the truth and wisdom of this expression of St. Jerome in the fourth century: "Therefore was one of the twelve set over all the others as the recognized Head, that all occasion of schism might be removed."

(Hier. adv. Jovian., lib. I., No. 26.)

That there cannot be a "unity of spirit" when the various persons maintain a variety of faith. Neither can there be "a bond of peace" in such a conflict. They need the bond of peace, and what keeps them in the bond of peace is the Papacy.

XXV. That the efforts of the reformers to disprove Catholic claims are shown to be miserable failures by Protestant historians.

(a) They said that Peter was never in Rome.

(The quaint theory that St. Peter was never in Rome, is refuted by Protestant writers of note from Lightfoot to Harnack.)

(b) That he never had a See there.

(Millman says: "The succession of the Bishop of Rome from St. Peter was now, near 200 years after his death, an accredited tradition. (Vol. I, Book II, p. 66.)

(c) That Christ did not found His Church on Peter.

("The evasion," says Meyer, "often taken advantage of in the controversy with Rome, viz., that 'rock' means not St. Peter himself, but the firm faith and the confession of it of the Apostle is incorrect, since the demonstrative expression 'on this rock' can only mean the Apostle himself.")

(d) That 'petra' was not applied to Peter.

("Peter was to be the *'petra'* of the building of the Church," so says the learned Olshausen.)

Yes, *petrus* and *petra* are the very same word in different grammatical form. To call a man a *'petra'* would be like calling him Eliza.

(e) That England did not receive the faith from Rome.

(The sterling words of Lord Halifax should never be forgotten: "When for controversial purposes it is attempted to discover an origin for the English Church other than that of Rome, those who are acquainted with the facts are tempted to doubt our honesty, or at least the trustworthiness of our historical methods.")

(f) That the Forged Decretals were the source of Papal jurisdiction.

(The Forged Decretals appeared in A. D. 845 and it appears from Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church" and Smith's "Dict. Chris. Antiq.," Protestant authorities on the above, that *before* the time of Gregory I (590) appellate jurisdiction had been granted to the Popes over the *whole* Church).

This last objection is the silliest of the series, even sillier than trying to dynamite the rock of Peter.

Americans observe that while Anglicans usually deny special prerogatives conferred on Peter, these latter will sometimes concede them; but assert that they were only personal. Catholics maintain that these are *perpetual* and *attached to the office.* Peter's office must *necessarily continue*; for if the

Church continues, so must the *foundation*; if the flock continues, so must the *shepherd*; if the kingdom continues, so must the *keybearer of authority.*

"As that which Peter believed in Christ is permanent (says St. Leo, Serm. II *de Assumpt.*) so what Christ instituted in Peter is permanent."

Even La Marca, a favorite authority with Anglicans, says: "Since a head was constituted in the Church of Christ to remove the occasion of schism, as Jerome remarks, therefore was Peter's privilege a *real* one, to the perpetual advantage of the Church, and not personal, since the form of the Church, which must needs be perpetual, was set forth in the Apostolic College with its Head." (*Tract. de Singulari Primatu Petri.*)

Americans see, further, that the Papacy is part of Christianity, yea, the foundation and stronghold of Christianity; and that the Papacy did not come out of the Church, but rather that the Church came out of the Papacy. The Church starts with Peter, the first confessed Christian.

That it is false, deceptive, and unchristian to apply to a hostile institution the Scripture intended for, and applicable to, the Gospel Church.

That by no possibility can the texts referring to the Gospel Church refer to an institution not yet in existence. Hence, in A. D. 1492, the Scriptural Church texts referred to a Church, *already in existence*; and could not possibly be intended for a Church that would be started in the next century, in reformation days, especially when these were *opposition* Churches.

XXVI. There are few facts, if any, so strongly established in the New Testament as the special prerogatives conferred on Peter. These four wonderful Petrine texts *are astounding.* The man, whom the world calls the Christ-given-name-of Peter, is, after the Saviour, the *central figure* in the Gospels and the Acts. And this central figure have Englishmen for three centuries tried to obscure, and have foolishly flooded the world with Bibles in the *vain and unchristian* attempt to belittle the authority of that central figure! Let it be hoped that what was done in hatred may be utilized in love, when the position of Peter in Christ's plan of salvation will be more fully realized; and when unity with the chief pastor comes to be more appreciably contrasted with prodigality and disunion outside.

Christ prays specially for Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you (the plural number) that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed (not for all, but) for *thee,* that *thy* faith fail not; and *thou,* being once converted, confirm thy brethren." (St. Luke, 22:31, 32.) And in strange contrast to this astonishing prayer. Peter is *abused* by Christians. The man for whom Christ *specially prayed* has been *specially attacked* by Englishmen, since the Reformation!

XXVII. That the Ecclesia Elizabethana is a dissenter from the Gospel Church—the National Church of England in 1492, and hence has *no authority* to command obedience in spirituals from non-conformists. Only the Gospel Church—the church connected with Peter and Peter's successor

—can say "thus saith the Lord," or command obedience under penalty of sin, or hurl an anathema in the name, and by the authority, of the Almighty.

XXVIII. That if England believed for 1000 years that the Pope was Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church, as successor of St. Peter, *ex jure divino,* and if it were true and of faith then, it is true and of faith to-day. And why not, for was it not the declaration of Council and Convocation of the Gospel Church for 1000 years? And the *witnessing of the Holy Ghost* must be always consistent.

That the Blessed Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor of England, should settle this Papal Supremacy matter for doubting Englishmen for all time, for he declared that "the Church began with Christ, and has Him for its head, and St. Peter, His Vicar, after him, and the head under Him; and always since, the successor of Him continually," and sealed this belief in the Papal headship with his blood because, as he further said, "the Papal authority is grounded on the Divine law."

That immediate acknowledgment of this authority, *grounded on the Divine law,* is *imperative* on the English people for the exercise of jurisdiction, as well as to terminate schism and restore unity of the faith.

And this is the more imperative because English history for 1000 years prior to 1492 bears testimony to this Spiritual authority. In searching its pages, it is not so much a question of seeking the acknowledgement of this authority as *where to*

find its denial. Nay, more. Not only do we fail to find a denial in pre-reformation days; but is it not a startling fact that "notwithstanding the supremacy and uniformity acts *unjustly* and *illegally* forced upon the English clergy by Henry and Elizabeth, there is nowhere to be found in the formularies of the Anglican Communion to this day a specific denial or rejection of the *de jure divino* Primacy of the Bishop of Rome." (*Prince of the Apostles,* p. 189.)

XXIX. That fifty well known public men in England wrote answers to the question asked in the "Christian Commonwealth," London, "What is the one thing above all others for which the British people should strive in 1909?" Has any one of them stated in that "Christian" publication, that the paramount question for English Christians is to heal their unscriptural schism and *unchristian divisions?* That great Christian commoner, W. E. Gladstone, once said that the greatest need of the modern world is "the sense of sin." And if schism is sin, and if England is in schism, Americans think that there ought to be a general purification or house-cleaning inaugurated across the water this very year.

XXX. As the Popes praise the freedom which the Church enjoys in the United States; and as the principles of the Constitution are founded on Catholic principles; and as the Church has found here all, or nearly all, she wants, or had ever struggled for; it is evident that Catholics are firmly bent on upholding this Government. Seeing her honor and justice in *purchasing* Church property

in the Philippines, as contrasted with the French government *confiscating* Church property, is it any wonder that Catholics admire Columbia, and swear to defend her against all foreign princes and potentates. And as in European countries where exists union of Church and State, sometimes the wrong acts of the State were attributed to the Church, American Catholics rejoice that *distinction* of Church from State prevails here. We find moreover in pre-reformation days many quarrels in England with the Church, but these quarrels principally arose because the line between temporal and spiritual affairs—between State and Church matters—was *not* clearly delineated, and that they were quarrels rather over *tax* than faith.

Americans enjoy the sweets of Church freedom and prize its blessings; and truly appreciate what St. Anselm wrote to his sovereign: "There's nothing God loves more than the liberty of His Church."

XXXI. Christ in establishing His Church, established Church government. In "the Kingdom which will never fail," is authority to see that whatsoever Christ had commanded be *observed* and *maintained.*

And if persons are bound to obey the temporal government, and if it be true that those who resist lawful, constitutional government purchase unto themselves damnation, what are we to say to those who resist the *spiritual* government, the government set up by the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords?

And as the British government and the United

States government best know the rights and principles on which their governments are constituted, and are the best interpreters of *their* laws, so the Christian government—the Catholic Church, whose seat of government is at Rome, best knows her rights, privileges and principles, and is the best and surest interpreter of *her* laws. She has the administration of the gospel message, and she challenges the world to prove her administration wrong. If other governments correctly expound the principles of *their* constitution, how much better can the Church government expound *hers,* seeing that she has the *assured co-operation of Christ and the Holy Spirit?*

XXXII. Americans see that as the true religion, the religion of the Saviour, must be for all—cannot be insular, but must be universal; so the Saviour's Church—the Gospel Church—must be a world Church, an international Church. "ALL power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth, going therefore, teach ye ALL nations, * * * teaching them to observe ALL things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you ALL days to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt., 28:19-20.)

They, having ALL power, were to teach in their corporate capacity *all nations, all the truth, all the time*; and the Church whose office it is to teach in this "whole" or complete manner, is called Catholic or whole. And if Englishmen like all the truth, all the time, as people of the United States do; then the English nation, as well as the American, should attend to the Catholic Church, as she

is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15) and has ALL POWER AND AUTHORITY to teach it. Americans ought to have Christ's truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—*no guesses,* nor doubtful interpretation in matters of doctrine. No one can *teach the whole truth,* only she who *received the whole truth* from the Master Himself. Moreover, if the Catholic faith and sacraments were God's remedy to heal the corruption of society in the time of our Savior, they are the remedy to-day. Hence, then, there is *only one Church,* that has a name indicating it to be the Church of the Almighty, the International Church, the Saving Church. While the sects either get their names from some man, as the Lutheran, Calvinistic or Wesleyan; or from some peculiar doctrine, as the Baptist; the Church of God—the Catholic Church—the Church connected with Peter—the Gospel Church—gets its name from its Divine Office.

As our Saviour came to save sinners, so His Church has compassion for the sinner and the unfortunate; and desires to administer the Sacraments for their benefit and comfort. Froude expressed a very great truth when he said: "in proportion to the depth with which men feel sin will they 'gravitate toward Rome.'"

If all the Creeds the Anglo-Saxon ever knew—the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian—demand belief in the Catholic Church, why does not every one of Anglo-Saxon descent comply with that belief? Moreover Art. VIII says: "The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and

that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Why then are they not thoroughly received and believed? The friendly purpose of this "Appeal to Anglicans" is to direct attention to the fact that they *are not* thoroughly received and believed as this Article requires. If this Article of the present National Church in England demands belief in these three Creeds, it is strangely inconsistent that not only do the people disregard its inforcement, but so does that Church herself. These Creeds declare for ONE CHURCH. The Ecclesia Elizabethana is a living violation of these Creeds—it is a *separate* Church! It is separated in communion and in several matters of faith from that Church—the Gospel Church—the historic Catholic Church—the Church referred to in these Creeds; and whose head has been the Pope of Rome.

Nay more, it is a Protestant church. Coronation day 1911 witnessed a strange scene, as Coronation days have in the past couple of centuries. The Sovereign, the Head of the Ecclesia Elizabethana that thus professes Catholic creeds, must swear before the world that he is an upholder *not* of the Catholic, but of the Protestant religion! Is it any wonder the Pagans remain unconverted? Is it any wonder Pagans mock Christians? Any wonder that Paganism and Mohammedanism are on the increase, as was lamented at the Missionary Congress of Protestants at Edinburgh in 1910?

XXXIII. That George, as successor of Edward, claims allegiance from every country that constitutes his world-wide empire, although that allegiance is based largely on conquest and the sword. So it is reasonable that Pius, as successor of Peter, should claim allegiance of the entire flock—the faithful in every land, especially as it is *authorized* by the Master. Why, then, should England further refuse this spiritual allegiance? Englishmen, too, would probably feel bad if Australia, India, or Ireland should separate from the unity of the British empire, although there is no divine law requiring this unity; so also Christians must have felt bad in days agone, as Christians feel bad to-day, that England is separated in faith, in communion and in government from the Christian empire, the Catholic Church, in violation of divine law and regulation!

XXXIV. If nothing is to be believed by Anglicans except what may be taken out of Holy Scripture (Art. XXI) what text authorizes the King or Caesar to be the spiritual head of the Church, or empowers them to confer spiritual jurisdiction: or what text deprives the papacy of its Christ-given office of feeding the entire flock? Englishmen have resisted the claims of pretenders to the throne, and they have guarded minor titles: witness the Tichborne case. Americans, therefore, are at a loss to know why Englishmen would take part in such a mockery as to try to confer the keys of a Kingdom, not of this world, on any earthly prince?

XXXV. That as the Gospel Church, founded on Peter—identified with Peter and Peter's suc-

cessors down to our own day, inherits the wonderful promises of our Savior, she ought to get in England to-day the recognition that she had in 1492, especially when the reformers have not proved (and cannot prove) that she lost these promises, and that they were transferred to them; and especially when we see the ruin that has befallen Christendom in the numerous divisions consequent on rejecting the Papacy.

Americans have read much in the English press about idolatry and corrupt doctrine of the faithful in days previous to the Reformation. The most effective means of corrupting doctrine would be to corrupt the Scripture. And it must never be forgotten that the Church did not corrupt the Scriptures although *her accusers did.* Let Erasmus, a witness and conspicuous actor in those days, speak: "Such is the state of the Catholic Church at present, that were Paul himself to descend from heaven to witness it, it would not, I think, displease him."

Americans note that the non-Conformists of England are practicing similar tactics toward Anglicans that Anglicans, or the Ecclesia Elizabethana, practised toward the Catholic Church. England is a miniature picture of Christianity to-day. Christianity there is in three hostile camps—Catholicism, Anglicanism, and non-Conformity. And the Christianity of the world is Catholic, Schismatic and Heretical.

Americans observe in English history that much trouble and dissension have arisen in England in matters of faith from utterances of unauthorized

agitators; sometimes well meaning but self-deluded. The dangerous, unchristian, and unscrupulous utterances that led to the Gordon Riots are given in illustration. As well have the King and Parliament hand over the government of England to the Socialistic propaganda as to have unauthorized preachers assume the rights of the *Ecclesia docens et regnans*—the Church teaching and governing—the Church teaching the faithful to *observe* what Christ taught.

XXXVI. That in so far as they are men of honor, justice, and religion, it is incumbent on Englishmen of every class, creed, and condition, to heartily co-operate from this very day in restoring the unity of the faith throughout the English-speaking world, to the end, that securing their own salvation in the unity of the faith, the reunited forces may also bear to heathen nations, and especially to that trinity of nations—India, China and Japan—the faith that Augustine brought to the Anglo-Saxon pagans.

If England will not exert herself to restore unity in Christendom for this desirable end, shall Americans witness the Orient as an instrument of her Providential chastisement?

She may, however, content herself with sending non-Catholic missionaries to the Orient, which must be admitted to be a strange procedure for one that officially declares—sets forth in her Prayer Book, that "*Catholic* Creeds must be thoroughly received and believed." Believing in *One, Catholic* and *Apostolic* Church,—and yet sending a delegate of a different church,—one that is neither *Catholic* nor *Apostolic,* will strike Americans as it

may strike Japanese, as being an *unwarranted* proceeding. These non-Catholic missionaries may, however, find it hard to get themselves accredited amongst the *Japanese,* recollecting that their former Apostle—St. Francis Xavier (in whose life are recorded fifty-one miracles and prophecies), was a Catholic; and that he raised the dead to life; and that his body was found incorrupt and sweet smelling in the tomb at Goa, India,—recollecting these things the wily Japanese have been testing non-Catholic missionaries. "Francis Xavier," say they, "raised four from death to life, we will believe your teaching in preference if you raise *eight.*" Needless to say, non-Catholic missionaries, to the present date, have not reached this standard of qualification.

XXXVII. Finally, Americans see that the Master's prayer for unity is fulfilled and illustrated in the Catholic Church. And while He prayed for unity amongst His real followers, and for the true believers; yet He did not pray for the world, "I pray not for the world;" and, of course, He does *not pray* for those who from worldly motives, divide the Church, or keep it divided, and thus *oppose* His prayer and wish for unity.

XXXVIII. Americans candidly admit that in this Review there are matters that puzzle them.

Some of these puzzles are:

If Henry VIII were excommunicated from the Catholic Church in July, 1533, how could he start a branch of the Catholic Church in 1534?

In 1521, Henry published his famous work, entitled *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum,* and dedi-

cated it to Leo X, and for this, the title of "Defender of the Faith" was conferred on him.

What the King's sentiments were at this time admit of no dispute; and he expressly declares that "every Church of the faithful acknowledges and venerates the Roman See as its Mother and Primate." (*England and the Holy See,* by Spencer Jones, p. 13.)

If then, the Ecclesia Anglicana, was a daughter in 1521, how can she be, according to Anglicans, a *sister* in 1910?

If there be 400 various and contradictory creeds in England, how can any sane man assert that the God of truth can endorse *each* of these as *right and lawful?* Or how can 400 *doctrines,* opposite and contradictory to one another, be reconciled to *one* and the *same Gospel truth?*

If Christ and the Paraclete are with the Church how, then, do these "smart" Christians accusing the Church—the Catholic Church—of error, reconcile their accusation with the fact that the Spirit of Truth has dwelt in the Church constantly since the memorable day of Pentecost to teach her all truth, thus preserving her from error?

If Article VIII declares for Catholic Creeds, and if the King is head of the National Church that declares for these Creeds, Americans cannot see why Englishmen humiliated their King into forcing him to take a *non-Catholic oath* before he could be crowned. Yes, an oath that has been openly and professedly Protestant.

If Anglicans consider the Donatists as outside the Church; if they consider the Monophysites as

outside also (as they do); and if the same authority—the same Church, that declared the Donatists, schismatics; and the Monophysites, heretics; says also that Anglicans are in a similar position, Americans cannot see why Englishmen do not realize their *unsafe position.* St. Augustin, the great bishop of Hippo, is revered by Anglicans. In the Synodal epistle of the Council of Zerta, drawn up by him, he there tells the Donatists: "Whoever is separated from this Catholic Church, however innocently he may think he lives, for this *crime alone,* that he is SEPARATED FROM THE UNITY OF CHRIST, HE WILL NOT HAVE LIFE, BUT THE ANGER OF GOD WILL REMAIN UPON HIM." The Catholic Church is as much the Catholic Church to-day as then. She has as much authority to-day as when the Donatists and Greeks and Anglicans seceded from her. Just as England is still England, although she lost the French Provinces and the American colonies.

XXXIX. Americans are aware of the deep veneration that people of the Anglo-Saxon race entertain for Gregory, their father in Christ, and Bede their historian; and hence this Review is concluded by quoting them. Referring to Constantinople St. Gregory writes:

"As to what they say of the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See? This is constantly owned by the most pious Emperor and by our brother the Bishop of that city." (Lib. IX, Ep. 12.) And again: "It is evident to all acquainted with the gospel, that by our Lord's words the care of the whole Church

was committed to St Peter, Apostle, and Prince of all Apostles" (lib. V, ep. XX.) "Who," he asks, "is ignorant that the Church is established on the firmness of the Chief of the Apostles?"

Ven. (St.) Bede says of Pope Gregory: "And whereas he was the Primate all over the world, and was placed over the churches already reduced to the faith of truth, *he made our nation,* till then given up to idols, *the Church of Christ.*" (Hist. Eccles. lib. II, c. I). Regarding the Headship of the Church and Schism he says: "And therefore did Blessed Peter, having confessed Christ with a true faith and followed Him with a true love, receive in a special manner the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven and the sovereignty of judicial power, that all the faithful throughout the world might understand that *whosoever separated themselves from the unity of faith or from his fellowship can neither be released from the chains of their sins nor enter the gate of the Heavenly Kingdom.*" (Hom. lib. 16.)

Judged by these statements Anglicans of to-day are found sadly wanting.

Heaven knows it is time that these deficiencies be supplied, and

"Let the Peace of Christ rejoice in your hearts, wherein also you are called in *One Body;* and be ye thankful."—Col. 3:15.

"May the God of Peace, Who brought again from the dead the Great Pastor of the sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Blood of the Everlasting Testament, fit you in all goodness, that you may do His Will."—Heb. 13:20-21.

(See Part II for Annotations and Corroborations.)

POINTS IN THE APPEAL OF SPECIAL INTEREST

We present this Appeal ardently hoping for active and immediate co-operation. Who would not fight for a benefactor, or who would not long to meet a long lost friend? The Catholic faith was the friend and heritage of England ere the troubles brought on by Henry VIII and his children. It is strange that England would not ardently re-seek its lost friend, and earnestly endeavor to recover its lost heritage. The reasons for recovery are as strong as those that might prevail in England in 1492 to retain it. Columbus, who threw this country open to European activity, brought the faith to this land, and in America arises the cry that England re-adopt the tried and ancient faith of that date, as well for her own good, as for English speaking people here, and throughout the world beside, and for the unconverted pagan.

We claim that there is only one heavenly—one Christian faith—one Divine revelation. All are bound to accept this one faith. The Church—the Church of the nations—the Church Catholic—has been the custodian of these matters of faith, having received them from her Divine Master. She was authorized, nay, *commanded*, to teach the world this Divine truth. She has done so, faithfully and fearlessly. She is the one great power or authority that commands attention today, as she has commanded the world's attention for the past eighteen centuries. If the Church has this essential faith in its entirety, it requires no dogma to declare that those outside her communion are not in the state of salvation.

One of the greatest wonders, if not the greatest, is the unity of the Church of all nations—unity amidst such an almost endless variety of persons and affairs. This Church of all nations that refuses to be nationalized, or belong to one nation exclusively, the Church of today, is inseparably connected with Apostolic days and doctrine.

She would not be characterized by unity, but rather by diversity, if her faith were human. If her faith were a matter of private interpretation, it would be as varied as humanity, but being Divine, it is one; and men acquiring and holding on to the unchangable, the divine, the true, are kept unified.

We are, therefore, insistent on faith because it is absolutely necessary. We are insistent on unity in the faith

because it is the wish and prayer of our Divine Saviour, because it is to be the great sign to the world of His Divine Mission, and because there is but one faith.

But there are other sins besides that of unbelief. Undoubtedly so; and our blessed and consoling faith tells us of the Sacrament of Penance, in which the sins of those who have faith may be forgiven, and thus become again pleasing to the Most High. But "without faith it is impossible to please God."

Individuals and dynasties may come and go, but the Church of the living God goes on forever. Men pass away, but "the truth of the Lord remaineth forever." (Ps. 116:2.) Nor are we in a great measure dismayed at the separation of Church and State occurring these days in the old countries, although in those Catholic countries the Church and State ought to be in accord for the good of the people. We are more dismayed at the rottenness and malice manifested towards the Church, at the dissolution, by persons who ought to be loyal and true to their God-given principles.

A Revolution and Its Effects.

In the 16th century there was a revolution against religious authority, whose baneful effects are not only felt in the religious, but also in the social world. God is the supreme authority, and what He arranges should command respect. If He arranged for the preservation of religious unity, as the Church tells us He did, men are in the wrong to disturb that arrangement. If kings and nations try to ruin God's authority, their action results in the ruin of their own authority—of that authority existing between man and man. "All power which does not produce obedience and veneration," says Lacordaire, "prepares but its own dissolution." Who would willingly obey the man that spurns God? Rulers and nations may have armies and navies, but who can depend on their allegiance, when they sever their allegiance to God? Having rebelled against God's authority, the sects recognize no spiritual authority, and have none within their ranks. Here, then, is the difficulty—the obstacle to reunion.

No Personal Abuse nor Personalities.

We wish it distinctly understood that we make no reference to person's immoralities as they appear in Church history except in so far as it is necessary and as affecting

the unity in faith. We ask: Is it likely that Heaven would send a person conspicuous for bad morals to specially and radically change the one faith? We are directing attention to that pure, true faith which is so necessary for salvation. We would fain help men to acquire a knowledge of the truths of faith, leaving to each one the application of that faith in his own individual life. Mankind is sinful. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."—I John 1:8. The Church has declared that amongst all those who have lived since Pentecost, there is only one sinless—Mary Immaculate. We need not, therefore, be reminded of sinfulness, notorious amongst the members of the Church at any period. For no man's immoralities can cancel that Gospel faith which all must believe. No churchman's crimes can obliterate the obligation of hearing the Church under penalty of damnation.

Nor have we to be reminded of the Great Western Schism, that great family quarrel in 1378, when factions within the Church abused and cursed each other. This Schism lasted 39 years. There were two claimants for the Papacy and it is evident, that in either case, there was valid succession. This Schism was only **material**, not formal. We admit there was great difficulty in recognizing the lawful claimant amid the confusion, but it must never be forgotten that the **principle of obedience to the legitimate Pontiff** was not denied.

No doubt such Schism shocked the Christian world. But we are directing the attention of Christians—Christians who consider themselves part of the Church—to a shocking state of affairs that has continued for over three centuries. We are directing attention to **formal** Schism—**real** Schism—Schism **characterized by disobedience to lawful authority**—Schism that has **scandalized the entire world for** so long, and we ask these Christians "Is it not time to have this Schism terminated?" Who can recount all the harm done to the world; who can recount all the wrong done amongst the sects in this period under the name of religion?

But as 1913 is the Anniversary of the Edict of Milan, that brought peace to the Church after three centuries of pagan warfare, would that it may herald in peace to distracted Christendom after three centuries of un-godly **strife!**

The Important Question.

We make a sincere, earnest effort in the love of God to impress on the reader the importance and necessity of the Church. Instead of taking up various matters of faith we prefer to mainly direct attention to this helpful institution. We implore the reader to investigate the matter most carefully and devotedly. Let him ask himself: "Has Christ, then, established a Church impowered, authorized, commanded to teach for Him? If so, nothing should hinder me from availing myself of her assistance and adminstration." When the investigator has found God's teacher then all she teaches will, or ought to be, accepted without hesitation. See how decided and absolute is His commission to her. He does not say "Go and discuss" "Go and argue," but "Go and teach," "Go and teach all nations and I will be with you all days." Never forget that as the Body of Christ is one, so is the Church which is His Body, one. Oh! the peace and joy of a good conscience. Freedom from Schism, Heresy, and other mortal sins is a foretaste of paradise. To be a member of God's Church, a member of His Body, to be sustained in our spiritual combats by the Sacraments efficacious in His Blood, is something indeed to be prized!

For the benefit of those "smart" men, who interpret the Holy Scriptures contrary to the Church, let it be loudly said: that Christianity is not a human, but a divine science; not natural, but supernatural truth. Let them also bear in mind that although the Apostles heard the heavenly message from the lips of the Divine Master, yet they refrained from preaching for the ten days after the Ascension, until they surely and visibly received the Spirit of Truth at Pentecost for their enlightment and guidance.

Peter's Headquarters.

The Kingdom of God on this earth of ours—the great Christian community—was established by our Savior. At its head He appointed Peter and gave him the keys of that kingdom. He made Peter the Chief Pastor of the flock. In his official capacity did Peter make the promulgation of Christianity on the first Pentecostal Day. He was miraculously delivered from the Jewish prison in order to take up his abode elsewhere.

He goes to Rome to make it headquarters of this kingdom of Heaven. The world might well mock at this plain man of toil, without friends, or worldly resources, wending his way to conquer imperial Rome for His Divine Master. For three centuries was the unequal contest carried on between Peter and his successors, and the mighty empire intoxicated with the conquest of nations. Persecutions, brutal, fierce and sanguinary were waged against the followers of the Nazarene; and at length victory was declared; not however in favor of the conquerors of the nations; but in favor of those whom God allowed to be driven from earth unto the Catacombs of Rome, in order to signalize their victory the more. At the close of the dire persecution, the Christians share the splendors of the imperial throne. And the first general meeting of the Christians of the world over, at Nice in the 4th century, declares that Rome—the see of Peter—holds and always held the Primary of Christendom. And as in the first three centuries of conflict with Roman paganism, so also in these four centuries that she has been persecuted by the rebellious, she has not yielded one jot or tittle of her faith.

Loyalty to God and His Authority.

Freemasonry under the Grand Orient is not Christian; it ignores Christ. Judaism is not Christian; it opposes Christ. Infidelity and anarchy are not Christian; they seek to destroy Christ, and today we see these sinister forces coalesced in hostility against the principal factor in the Christian world, while the puny Christian factions look on approvingly!

Man, forsooth, considers it proper to assail religious truth, although he knows it is not proper to reject scientific, historic, physical, or mathematical facts and truths admitted by the learned world. To assail these facts would be to stignatimze the assailant as a fool or fanatic. Why then should it be proper to reject matters of faith—facts that are stamped with the Divine seal of certainty?

What spectacle more sublime than to see God looking on at the conflict for Him conducted by Michael and his angels against Lucifer and his rebels? So also, no doubt, He looks with complacency on men here below, advocating the right and the true and the godly—endeavoring to overcome man's wrong, false, irreligious, and agnostic ideas.

And now as then let Michael's question be asked: Quis ut Deus—"Who is like God?" Who so deserving of praise as the God of love and mercy and goodness? Who can so reward His faithful followers as He? But as when our Saviour spoke to the people of Capharnaum, so also today, he leaves individuals and people the exercise of their free will, and if they so wish, they can "go away and walk no more with Him." We hate to see Protestants, or Catholics lose their faith, or lapse into infidelity and thus make such a fatal choice.

Let Us be Guided Aright by This Authority.

We all want the correct doctrine—the true faith—no imitation or adulteration. But can't we acquire this genuine faith, this heavenly doctrine, ourselves without being taught? This system by teaching, as we have seen, is Christ's own plan of instruction for the world. Is it possible for us to devise a better plan for ourselves? Suppose we take the Bible, the New Testament, and guide ourselves, and perchance find out the correct doctrine. First of all it must be borne in mind that the New Testament was written for those who were already taught according to God's plan. Let us then be first taught a-right, and then read the Sacred Writings to corroborate that teaching, so as to strengthen our convictions, for we see that those who teach themselves are not taught a-right. Witness how one Bible-taught sect contradicts the other. Yes, even individual members of the same sect contradict one another. Neither will the Lutheran be a Methodist or Baptist, for each considers the other wrong, and vice versa. And so with the other sects. Judging by these self guides their system is wrong and leads to ruinous results. Nor do we say this in any way derogatory to the New Testament writings, which the members of the Catholic Church composed; and which the Church has preserved and defended as the apple of her eye. But in order to point out and emphasize Christ's plan of obtaining the faith, as manifested on the first Pentecostal Day, these lines are penned, inviting Christians to realize that there has been a Chief Pastor by the Good Shepherd's own wise arrangement; and recognizing that Divine arrangement we entreat them to fall in line under the Divinely arranged commander-in-chief in this our day, to lead the hosts of the Lord to extend the kingdom amongst

those who know not God nor Jesus Whom He has sent If St. Clement, disciple of St. Peter, compared the Church to an army under its officers, it is not amiss to do so today, when a directing hand is more needed and a greater conquest to be obtained.

In connection with the authority of the Church it is interesting to quote what Rev. M. A. Bullock, a leading Congregationalist minister, in his letter to the "Journal," Lincoln, Neb., says: "Christianity could exist if the Bibel had never been written. The Christian Church would have been established without the Bible and, indeed, was established before any portion of the New Testament had been written. The Christian religion does not depend upon the Bible for its existence, but without Christianity and its historic predecessor, the Jewish Church, there would have been no Bible." ("The True Voice," Dec. 9, 1910.)

The Divine Authority—The Church—Received The Entire Revelation.

The world's own Church—the Catholic, and the world's own Book—the Bible, are God's great aids to the world. They both go together. No danger of conflict between the Church and her book. They are like the parallel lines of a railroad bearing the precious freight to its destination. Or to be more concise they are like a monorail.

As the State law—the law of man, is interpreted by a Supreme Court rendered as infallible as human means can devise, so the Bible—the law of God, must be interpreted by a Supreme Court. That Supreme Court is supplied by Christ Himself. His Church is that supreme, infallible, guaranteed interpreter, which gives uniformity to the one true meaning of the text.

No one disputes the great knowledge that St. Jerome possessed of the Scriptures. He was amply versed in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages. It was he who gave us the Vulgate edition of the New Testament. And as the result of his profound knowledge of the Scriptures he declares that communion with the Pope is necessary for Christians.

Let us impress on persons that in vain do they read the Scriptures, if reading therein: "Simon you shall be called Peter (-rock);" "Thou art Peter (-Rock);" "I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom;" "Feed my lambs, Feed my sheep;" and still deny special prerogatives to the man so addressed!

In vain do persons read the Scriptures, if they "will not hear the Church;" if they despise those teachers sent; or refuse to be governed by those having lawful and valid succession in that Church considered the Gospel Church—known to be the Gospel Church—in England in 1492.

"But there are also many other things which Jesus did; which, if they were written every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written."—St. John, 21:25. Thus does the disciple close his narrative of what Jesus said and did, "And we know that his testimony is true." It is surprising then, how little the Evangelists give us of the actions and words of Our Divine Savior. Just a few pages and much of what they give is duplicate. But all His teaching and revelation is embodied in His Church, for the Apostles were witnesses of what He said and did. Is it any wonder that the Fathers enthusiastically saluted the Church as "the pillar, the tower, the buttress of truth?" Is it any wonder that the golden-mouthed John referred to her in such sublime terms, saying amongst other wonderful things, "It is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched than for the Church to be invisible?" (See p. 221.) Is it any wonder she is so strong in her dogmas—unswerving in her teaching about Sacramental Confession, solid in her doctrine about the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, and equally firm regarding the greatness and efficacy of the other Sacraments? Any wonder that she is so insistent on her children attending on Sundays at that wonder of wonders—the ineffable Sacrifice of the Mass? Any wonder in fine that she is so steadfast and uncompromising with truth? And when we witness a sect appropriate some of her writings, and in ignorance, falsity and malice assail her we can use no word to adequately express our condemnation of such tactics and pity for the duped!

This Appeal then is written in the interest of Christianity and not controversy. In the first place, what cause more worthy than to promote the fulfillment of what may be regarded as the dying wish and prayer of Jesus Christ? What cause more unworthy than to impede or oppose it?

We base our Appeal on one divine faith, and any one advocating two is condemned, not only by God but

by the Christian world, and hence he has no case. Consequently we lay down that diversity in faith and creed is wrong.

Christ's Constitution and Government.

We who have accepted Jesus must accept His one faith. To accept Jesus is to accept Him entirely not only to accept Him as our Divine Redeemer, but also to accept His doctrine and arrangements.

And if He is with the Church today as He said He would ("I am with you always"), and if the Church is His Mystical Body, as the Bible says it is, we earnestly invite all persons to accept Him, to accept the Church as their teacher, their helper, and become members of His Mystical Body. Christians must think with Christ's mind—they must be in accord with it. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus"—Phil. 2: 5.

To accept Jesus on the first Pentecostal Day from Peter on his word (Acts 2:14), to be baptized in Jesus, was not only to accept Him as the Redeemer, but also to accept His divine doctrine and divine arrangement for the upholding of that doctrine. And to accept Jesus in this 20th century from Peter's successor is the same. Moreover we can look down the avenue of nineteen centuries and see those arrangements—a teaching, administering Church under its chief pastorate.

As George Washington gave this country a constitution and a government, more so did Jesus Christ give His Kingdom on earth—the Church, a constitution and a government. This wonderful doctrine and power were not conveyed by any text or prophecy, but were conveyed by the Divine lips to the Apostles; and from their lips this very same doctrine and power have been conveyed down to us in the Apostolic succession. In no other way, unless indeed some one is especially called in a clear and miraculous manner as was Saul of Tarsus. The Almighty mandate, "Go, teach all nations," "Teach them to observe" was afterwards recorded in the New Testament. We don't approve of citizens adopting the constitution, but trying to overthrow the government. Such would be treason. So also in Church matters. Persons trying to have unity of faith by reading the New Testament, with contempt of Church authority, are not only disloyal, but are trying the impossible. Christ does not say that He prays for such.

Our Saviour prayed for Unity, wants Unity, while unity on the Prostestant lines, of every one explaining for himself, is impossible. Evidently that condition that renders unity impossible must be removed if our Saviour is to have His way. We entreat our Protestant friends to take a reasonable view of the situation. Let us see for whom does our Redeemer pray.

He prays for the unity of those who believe in Him through authorized teaching—the ministry of the Church. The sects have not unity, because He does not pray for them. "And not for them only (the Apostles) do I pray but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me." (St. John 17:20.) Yes, through their Apostolic ministry. And St. Paul says: "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith"—2 Tim. 1:13. We implore persons not to incur the penalty of disobedience to the Church. "He that will not hear the Church let him be unto thee as the heathen," "He that despises you, despises Me;" we ask them not to continue in the damnable condition of schism and heresy; but to return to unity, and avail themselves of those heavenly helps sacramentally prepared for those of the fold.

Yes, let us kindly remind our separated brethren of our Divine Redeemer's loving solicitude that they return to unity. "And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd" (St. John 10: 16); and let us earnestly request them to comply with His loving solicitude and return to the one fold —return now.

Our Saviour promised to found His Church. We find in the Acts the fulfillment of His promise, and that this one Church was established in numerous places. There is, therefore, only one Christian Church which was to be spread throughout the world, diffusing the one Divine faith. And if any Church, today, has this one Divine faith, it must be that first Church continuing down to our time. There are not two Christian churches, one for the purpose of fighting the other. Hence anyone advocating two conflicting churches advocates something wrong and deserves no attention.

How Can Secession From a Divinely Arranged and Divinely Guaranteed Government be Justifiable?

How can Anglicans, or others separated from the Church, regarded as the Gospel Church in 1492, justify their secession? The Church accounts for herself and gives testimony that she was started a-right by Divine power and authority, and was promised co-operation by the Redeemer so as to be kept a-right. And as if this were not sufficient for a doubting world, He promised, and afterwards sent, another Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth to abide with the Church forever. These scriptural corroborations can the Church quote to sustain her assertion. In view, therefore, of this double Divine co-operation, so to say, how can anyone, calling himself a believer in the Man-God, accuse His Church of failing in her mission? And if she has not failed, and still preserves the words of Eternal Life—still has the Redeemer's co-operation and presence—still has the Spirit of Truth dwelling in her—where is the justification for any Christian to rebel against her? Where?

In 1559, when Queen Elizabeth was about to introduce a new religion, bills were introduced into Parliament annexing the jurisdiction necessary for the correction of errors, heresies, schisms, and abuses to the crown; and requiring persons to take an oath declaring the Queen to be supreme governor in all ecclesiastical and spiritual things or causes as well as temporal, and renouncing all foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within the realm.

"On the part of the clergy," says Lingard, "these bills experienced a most vigorous but fruitless opposition. The Convocation presented to the house of Lords a declaration of its belief in the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Supremacy of the Pope; with a protestation, that to decide on doctrine, sacraments, and discipline, belonged not to any lay assembly, but to the lawful pastors of the Church. Both Universities subscribed the confession of the Convocation; and the bishops unanimously seized every opportunity to speak, and to vote against the measure." ("Lingard His. of Eng." under date, Feb. 28, 1559.)

Lingard is considered a reliable historian. Here he places on record the voluntary, unrestrained, unanimous declaration of the English Church. Convocation and the

two Universities expressed their confidence in the Catholic Church by professing dogmas characteristic of the Catholic faith then, as they are Catholic faith today.

In that very year that Elizabeth and Cecil were planning a new religion, which she established by penalties and death, do we find the English Church encouraging her by declaring that the Church failed and that the Supremacy of the Vicar of Christ should be denied? No, a thousand times, no! The declaration of the English Church, uncoerced and unanimous, in 1559, upholding the Supremacy of the Vicar of Christ, stands as conclusive evidence to Americans that Elizabeth and her new Church were unjustified, and the old Church right; all quibbling to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Separation.

In 1559 we stood together. Energetically and unanimously did Convocation proclaim the 5 Articles. One of these was Papal Supremacy. Again, did the English Church clearly and undoubtedly declare itself Catholic—Roman Catholic. So did Elizabeth, but she was deceptive and vindictive. The Hierarchy discovered her falsity, and only one bishop attended her coronation. Soon we find the royal diplomat and Cecil, and a bribed and subservient Parliament, which she made her Sanhedrim, overthrowing the Church of Christ in her realm. But you may say, nay.

Let us apply the test. Do Anglicans profess these 5 Articles today? **They do not.** Why a man should deceive his own heart is for a man to answer for himself, but is it honorable and Christian to deceive his fellow men—to lead them into apostacy by sophistry and misrepresentation?

As tested in controverted questions Parliament, not Convocation, legislates for the Anglican or National Church. The sovereign has assumed the spiritual headship and the Pope is not allowed his place in the spiritual kingdom. Transubstantiation is denied. The august presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is so palmed over that the real presence or the real absence may be equally admitted by members. And although Disraeli called the Communion Service the Mass in masquerade, the statement is questionable seeing that the celebration of the august Sacrifice was punishable by death in the days of Elizabeth.

Orders, that confers the right and power to offer up this ineffable sacrifice, is rejected as a Sacrament; the number of these Sacraments being reduced, from seven of yore to two, in the Book of Common Prayer.

But it may be said there was a new revelation to justify the rejection of these five Articles and the overthrow of the Papacy in England. As well give this excuse for the smart set who have overthrown the Church in Portugal. We will be excused for saying that brutality, robbery, irreligion, and sacrilege characterized this rebellion or reformation in Portugal. Let Portuguese select what government they please, but let religion sacredly alone.

Can Britons Regain Former Status?

If Anglican repudiation of Rome means repudiation of Rome's dignities why does Canterbury still display its papal honors? Will those, who have been loudly claiming honors for Rome because it was the Imperial City, recognize now the action of that same authority that gave Canterbury importance, and acknowledge the pre-eminence of Cardinal Bourne in the English metropolis? Will Disestablishment in Wales remove the fads, follies, and fantasies of centuries, and leave the people there the same faith that prevailed in 1492?

Can these Britons thus emancipated, consequently, take their place in the Councils of the Church, as did their ancestors at Arles, Sardica and Nice? Let it never be forgotten by those who would fain claim Ephesus as the source of their faith through the ministry of St. Irenaeus, that he is pre-eminent amongst those in sub-Apostolic days for his pronouncements in favor of the Roman Church. American Catholics are not so fussy in this respect as the Anglicans. We don't care particularly whether it was Brendan, or Ericson, or Columbus, that first brought the Christian religion to America, for it was Catholic, Roman Catholic faith they brought—whether it came from Hibernia, Scandinavia, or Hispania, or came from Italia via Britannia through the Cabots. And American Catholics yield to none in their loyalty to the Apostolic See of Peter; and worthy of the zeal of Apostolic days spare no expense in providing cathedrals and churches, universities and colleges to keep the lamp of faith burning, so that their children can be taught about their blessed, Christian inheritance.

Is the Modern Papacy True?

"Is the modern papacy historically true and of primitive origin?" So asks the "American Catholic" (Prot. Epis.), published at Los Angeles. Even a child can see it is. The "Gerarchia Cattolica" gives a list of Roman Pontiffs from St. Peter to Pius X. It is a line of succession that commands the admiration of the historian. Now if the modern papacy be not historically true and of primitive origin, then Americans will be glad, in the interest of truth, to have our Los Angeles friend point out clearly and incontestably with which one of these pontiffs did the papacy originate, if not with Peter; bearing in mind that each General Council, so generally identified with the Papacy, considered itself a successor to the recognized General Council that preceded it.

There is a triple evidence of the Papacy in the days of the first council of Nice,—a threefold evidence of the importance of the See of Rome, that ought to satisfy everybody that the Papacy was a controlling power in Christendom, then as now. These facts are:

1) That the Pope convened the Council. So declared the 6th General Council. The Emperor Constantine aided.

2) That the Council itself declared that the Roman See always had the Primacy.

3) That the delegates of the Pope—Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, and the priests Vitus and Vincentius—presided over the Council; and signed the decrees before the Patriarchs and Metropolitans, although these delegates were only of priestly and episcopal dignity.

A still stranger circumstance in connection with the Papal presidency is "the fact that the early Councils were attended principally by Oriental bishops, while the Bishop of Rome was only represented by his Legates.

Nay, more; Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople, openly told the emperor Anastasius, that 'he himself could not proceed to define in matters of faith, because this was the office of an Ecumenical Council, presided over by the Pope.'" (See Alzog Vol. 1, p. 681; Hefele and others.)

Christians are unreasonable in asking for historic documents throwing clearer light on the history of the pre-Nicene Church—documents destroyed by barbarians and pagans; or in requiring evidence of a more compact or-

ganization at a period when the Church was struggling for existence in the Amphitheatre and the Catacombs!

And now having shown that the **Ecclesia Elizabethana** is not the Ecclesia Anglicana of 1492, having made it so clear that even a child can see, let us tell Anglicans and others interested something specially interesting. The Ecclesia Anglicana of 1492 is still in England. It never severed connection with Rome, and is today connected with it with Cardinal Bourne at its head. For 300 years and more it worshipped in its catacombs. At the Catholic Emancipation (1829) it raised its head, and today it can sing the faith of its fathers in the new Cathedral of Westminster!

In this instance we might use the words of Bryant:

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes with pain
And dies among his worshipers."

It is not, however, the national Church of England—the governmental religion as of yore. That distinction was transferred to the Ecclesia Elizabetha or Anglican Church. Whatever Catholicity this Church possessed remained dormant, with an occasional quiver to show it had some life; till we find an arousal after 300 years of slumber. In 1835 we find the Oxford movement calling into action what little Catholicity there was in the body. This movement intended to un-protestantize the Anglican Church. So Keble told of the National Apostacy. Newman was stunned to find what he considered a living stream only a stagnant pool, and what he considered the City placed on a mountain only the City of Confusion. The Anglican Church seems to be manifesting more Catholic principles every year; but it is not reviving as fast as the salvation of souls demand.

Another Reformation at Hand.

There are two matters deserving our admiration One is that Anglicans born within the State-made Church are reasoning themselves back through the Scriptures, the Fathers, and history to the Catholic Church—the Church of their forefathers. We admire the learning, purity of heart, unselfishness, and prayerfulness of these men who under the influence of divine grace follow the "kindly light" leading on, and wander back "o'er moor and fen" to the true fold, where there is rest, light and peace.

The other is, that we have indications of another reformation, or rather of a reformation within reformation circles—a returning to unity which the reformation rejected. The Reformation was diametrically opposed to the unity of scriptural faith. It promoted variety of faith, disunity, unlimited diversity. However paradoxical it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that a great lesson to the sects on unity will come from pagans, for Christianity is topsy turvy. (See elsewhere the Chinese Christian Conference.) The sects, if asked, collectively, by the pagan why are there so many spurious faiths amongst people who preach only **one** faith, why such disobedience to a church that all are **bound to obey**, would give answers very confused indeed.

The Church Can Tell.

Schism is condemnable, damnable. Anglicans have made themselves censurable by saying that they are not in Schism or separation from this first church—the Church of the Fathers—the Catholic Church revered in England in 1492 as the Church of Jesus Christ. Should some ask the English Government, did she know what States constituted her Kingdom when she was first established, what States she lost since, and what ones constitute her present empire, she could give an indisputable answer to such simple questions. And if the Christian Government—the Catholic Church—be asked similar questions, she can also give an indisputable answer. "Was the National Church in England in A. D. 1492 part of your Kingdom or Christian Commonwealth?" "Yes." "Is the National Church in England today a part?" "No." And it was in 1492, as it was in the days of Photius, Arius, Donatus and Simon Magus, separation from those associated with Peter in the Church constituted Schism. Anglicans, themselves, declare they are in Schism or separation from the Apostolic See, for Art. XXXVII says, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." Now in 1559, that constituted schism from his jurisdiction and the body he ruled; and placed Anglicans thus rejecting his jurisdiction, outside of that Church of which he was the acknowledged head. Then again look at how Anglicans seceded from other Catholic doctrines in so many essentials in their Prayer Book. Queen Elizabeth and all taking part

in the new service were excommunicated. The decree of Excommunication remains against those taking part in such services today. Anglicans, therefore, stating that they are connected with the Apostolic See and its Church, have no case.

A Perversion in Religion Prevails.

With many today the Church of the Bible—the Church of the Ages—the undying Church of God in our midst—the Catholic Church—is a name for evil, so wickedly has the Spouse of Christ been reviled.

Amongst those who take the Bible as their sole guide we find advocates for a multiplicity of faith, although the Good Book insists on one. These pervertly claim that rivalry and opposition to the one faith are advantageous.

Those having no power and authority pose with the dignity of those to whom all power was committed.

Those who have no authority to administer Sacraments, administer just as if lawfully ordained.

Those divinely admonished to hear the Church say "they will not."

There are some who believe that the opposite to the truth is the truth. There are some who believe that a lie will save you equally as the truth.

God has revealed to us heavenly truth and asks us to accept it in belief or faith. But there are some who think that God—the God of truth—can be worshipped as well by falsity as by the truth.

Nothing surpasses the word of God. Everything must surrender to His behests. How wrong, therefore, to reject what is laid down on God's authority for something laid down according to man's vain conceit and imagination. Agnostics give up the assured for what they are not assured. We hate to see chaos in the State. But anarchy and chaos are more disastrous in the spiritual life and have more abiding penalties. What a man believes to be truth, if it be not the truth, won't be as effective as the truth. Catholics are not deceived. We are sure that our faith is true, for it is divinely guaranteed.

One guiding himself from his Bible may tell you today he does not believe the miracles therein recorded. Another through a motive of curiosity may wish that miracles be performed anew. Just as if the wonders of old are not for his benefit also. But would such a person be converted to

Catholicism if the Lord vouchsafed such evidence before his eyes? Very doubtful, indeed, for if persons will not believe in Christ's own messenger—His representative—His ambassador to men, "they will not believe one from the dead." But there are modern wonders—miracles performed nowadays—Christian evidences given. And these are strangely enough in a land that has, nevertheless, become a scandal to the nations for its unfaithfulness to Christianity. To what purpose, therefore, are miracles to one that rejects the Church?

There are 3,353 miraculous cures recorded at Loudes, France, where the pile of crutches, left by visitors cured there, are the admiration of pilgrims to that famous shrine. Do you doubt? Amongst these cases there is one under special discussion—that of de Rudder, cured instantaneously of a fracture that doctors had vainly tried to cure for years; and Abbe Duplessy, Paris, will put down and forfeit 5,000 francs to any one who can disprove the cure. But to what purpose are these miracles we repeat?

In face of these facts how account for the conduct of our neighbors—France and Portugal? How account for the violence, robbery, sacrilege offered to the Church? The best, purest, noblest of their citizens abused or exiled. Every virtue dear to man, every principle that links good men together violated towards the Church. Let the unworthy citizen be duly punished, but why assail the Church?

How Account For It.

The Bossuet of America, His Grace the late Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, once said with regard to those unworthy persons who receive religious education and training and who belie it: "How account for their ingratitude to their religious mother and their present blind obstinacy of unbelief, if there be nothing in the Church herself or in her training, to account for such hostility? I reply by asking, what was there in the teaching and actions of our Lord that provoked such ingratitude, ending in crucifixion itself, on the part of the people on whom He conferred so many blessings and never did them injury? He seldom complained. But on one occasion, when His sensitive, grateful heart was amply wounded because the Jews took up stones to cast at Him, He turned upon these ingrates and indignantly said to them: 'Many good works have I

showed you from My Father, for which of these do you stone Me?' As if He would say: 'I made your blind to see and your lame to walk and your deaf to hear; I cleansed your lepers and raised your dead; for which of those do you stone Me?' So may the religious orders of France expostulate with those on whom they have bestowed nothing but good; whom they baptized and taught and civilized, whose sick they cured, whose broken-hearted they consoled, whose dead they buried. 'For which of these things, O France! do you stone us?' ''

Yes, deeds are perpetrated today that make us ashamed of our race. There are those today who seek to destroy the office of him caring for the lambs and the sheep of Christendom, as Herod of old sought to destroy the Child, the Founder of that Christendom; there are those who would crucify the Church, as her Divine Founder was. There are those today who would destroy the Church just as those ''sought to kill Lazarus because he was constant proof before the world of the power of Jesus Christ!''

The Church is not above her Spouse, the servant is not above the Master; and today the Church is giving most luminous evidence that she is the Bride of the Lamb; for one of the proofs that she is His Bride is her prophesied prosecution by bad, unbelieving men. And she is more militant today with her puny foes, than when Diocletian of old erected a monument to obliterated Christianity.

History is repeating itself. England, too, raised her hand against the Church. She persecuted in favor of a State-made Church, whereas, today, persecution is waged on the Continent in favor of black infidelity. But let the curtain remain down on the former scene. Let the pall envelop the gloomy past. We call attention to the matter in explanation of the chaos in the English-speaking world. Henceforth let wiser councils prevail, let more just measures abound, let unity in faith hold sway and let Christian hearts be melted as one with the love of God overcoming prejudice.

We rejoice to see Britannia now affording an asylum to those weary Continental exiles driven from their homes or native land. And if there be not room for them on European shores, Columbia sends them greeting and extends to them a hearty invitation to come. She has ample room and a warm welcome for those saintly heroes, those Christian exiles. She is the good Samaritan

who will treat them as kindly as was "the certain man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers." Already she has treated some of those exiles more kindly than the Samaritan of old. But we saw very few words of protest from the British or American Protestant Press against the brutal treatment inflicted on those nuns—those French and Portuguese ladies, practicing their virtues and exercising their rights. Is the age of chivalry gone? Is this old world lapsing into pre-Christian paganism?

The Church Knows Her Foundation.

"It is manifest from the originals," says a Lapide, "that the same word was used for rock in both places of the Petrine text. In the Syriac, Kepha, Kepha; or, Kipha, Kipha; Hebrew—Kepha, Kepha; Armenian—Bim, Bim; Arabic—Alsachra, Alsachra; Persian—Sanac, Sanac. To render literally into Latin it should read, "Tu es petra et super hanc petram," etc. The accommodating grammarians did not like to give the feminine form petra to a man and wrote it Petrus (in Greek, Petros.) The early fathers regarded the words the same, and away down the ages were so regarded by the faithful, and passed unchallenged till the critical, cynical, cantankerous Novatores discovered a mare's nest, and for three centuries Christendom has been disturbed with their nonsense.

Christ said He would build His Church on Peter when He addressed him as "Blessed." "Thou art Peter (rock) and upon this rock I will build My Church," using the same word, Cephas, "rock," in both places. Therefore those who say that He used different words deserve no attention.

The Church, as other governments, ought to know about her foundation, and she has emphatically and repeatedly said, that Christ founded her on Peter. That closes the case.

As then He established His Church, He gave her wonderful promises of assistance, and co-operation; and believing in His Divine veracity, and in the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and seeing the wonderful record of the Church's teaching in the past, how can we give any attention to any one assailing Christ's word or promises?

Evidently it is idle to quote the Fathers, Catholics as they were, against their own Church or its head, so as

to establish a system of disobedience and rebellion against him. The Fathers were loyal to the Church.

Let There be no False Claims in Such Vital Matters.

It puts Englishmen in a bad light before the world when they claim that the Pre-Reformation Church in England was not Catholic—Roman Catholic. To establish their ridiculous claim and pretentions they must destroy their State papers, and English and contemporaneous histories, and kill off those few English Catholics that survive to tell the tale of the Reformation, and the persecution of their ancestors for the faith. If, in fine, belief in the Papacy as a Divine Institution was National faith in England in 1492, it ought to be National faith today, if principles of right and honor hold place in English hearts.

Why would not Anglicans go back to the faith of old England in 1492, since it was largely the whims and folly of Henry and Elizabeth that caused the defection? Why would not the Anglicans and Greeks go back and abide by the rulings of their last General Council about the same period (Florence 1442)? Why would not Protestants of today go back and abide by the declaration of their Catholic forefathers, taking part in and accepting this Council? Such return is reasonable, religious, obligatory. And as at Pentecost and in 1492, so it is today, our guide in faith is a teaching church with its chief pastorate.

If it were conceded as true, that the Catholic Church in England in 1492 was the Gospel Church, it must be so conceded today. If it were conceded as true, that communion with the Bishop of Rome constituted membership in the Gospel Church, it must be so conceded today. If it were conceded that heresy and schism are damnable sins, they are so today. And if it were conceded as true that the Gospel Church, existing in England in 1492, had authority till then to explain the heavenly message by her dogmas, so also it must be conceded that the explanatory power remains and is in full force and efficacy today.

Thus it is evident that the main points in the Appeal cannot be controverted.

Let Truth Prevail.

Get hold, then, of the truth and let the truth get hold of you. Our Lord gave fickle, wavering men a guaranteed teacher of His truth. Let us receive the truth with

joyous acclaim, and let Christian truth he manifested in Christian lives. Jesus Christ taught Catholic or universal doctrine, and He commanded His Church to teach the same.

There is a false learning that is really conceited ignorance, there is a false liberty that would fain be a license for error and crime. The Church is the great friend of mankind, yet she has been abused, reviled and caricatured until hated. The Church is the university of the world, the universal Teacher of mankind. Yet, she, that nolds her charter as the world's teacher from the world's God, has been denounced as the foe to learning. She, that has the truth that makes us free, has been denounced as the foe to freedom. She, that has the administration of the sacraments unto sanctification, has been denounced as wicked.

But attend now to her ministry; hearken to the ambassadors of Christ presenting you the truth; avail yourselves of their ministry of reconciliation. Lay aside discordant gospels. Twenty million American Catholics are desirous to see dissentients return to the one faith; to the Church, its custodian; to Jesus, her founder. Back to the foot of the Cross, back to the Redeemer, back to God. The honor of Christendom demands your return to unity, your own salvation necessitates it, the conversion of the pagan requires it, the Redeemer wishes it.

If unbelief be wrong, abuse of faith be wicked, and schism and heresy be damnable sins, judgment will, surely, be demanded before the tribunal of an infinitely just God on men guilty of such sins, by him who was cast out of heaven for only one sin.

As we have the truth, we invite others to come share it; for although the Church received the entire revelation, she received it for the benefit of others. We deplore the condition of warring Christians today, outside the fold, as well as of those poor mortals who never heard of Jesus and the wonderful things He did for them in love and mercy. God will shower down His graces on the labors of the united hosts of the Lord, carrying salvation to the Pagan. Efforts of those outside the Church to convert the Pagan nations have proved to be failures in spite of great resources. Let us, therefore, unite and in a few years we may hope to see God so blessing united Christian effort as to renew the face of the earth.

Notes to the Appeal

I.—GROUNDS OF APPEAL.

"I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me: because they are Thine: And not only for them do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me; that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." John 17: 9-21.

"The belief of America in the Creator is emblazoned on the dome of the National Library at Washington in these words of the Holy Ghost: 'The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands' (Ps. 18, 2). St. Paul says: 'The invisible things of Him' (His existence, etc.) 'are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made. His eternal power also and divinity, so that they (unbelievers) are inexcusable.' Rom. 1, 20)."—"Catholic Belief."

Promote the Coming of the Kingdom to the Pagan.

Reunion in these pages means submission to an authority or Divine Teacher competent to maintain the union or unity.

We implore our readers, as they expect to meet their God in judgment, not to place any obstacle to reunion: we entreat all good persons as they hope for eternal reward to promote it.

We call this a Christian age. Then why not try in this our day, and co-operate to make it truly Christian, by making a united effort to promote Christianity amongst two-thirds of the world yet Pagan?

If the truths of faith be 100—then it is evident that each one must be believed, for each one is to be believed, because it is revealed truth. Therefore those who accept only 90, as the sects generally do, come under the terrible declaration of the Savior, "He that believes not shall be condemned."

The Godhead is characterized by unity. The Three Divine Persons constitute the one God. "Let us make man to our own image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26). Man ought therefore be distinguished for his love of upholding that heavenly faith, that is One.

It is not to be wondered at that the very profound English poet, Coleridge, was moved to say, having O'Connell in mind: "O, for a great man—for one really great man who could feel the power and weight of a principle and unflinchingly put it into action! See how triumphant in debate and action O'Connell is. Why? Because he asserts a broad principle and acts up to it—rests all his weight on it and has faith in it."

Oh, for a few really great Englishmen to bring back their fellow men to the God-given principle of unity in faith!

"The fool (he who is bereft of reason, or uses it perversely) says in his heart there is no God." When we see an effect we look around for the cause. If a savage found a watch—a timepiece—in the wilderness, he could reason that it had a maker. Daily and nightly we witness the grand machinery of the Universe, and who can deny that it had a Maker? Years ago this was beautifully put by Whately: "Whatever shows marks of design had an intelligent maker; the Universe shows marks of design, and therefore it had an intelligent Maker."

Eternity! Oh what a word! If you multiply a million by the number of letters in this Appeal, what an astounding product we would have! And if that figure would represent the years that a damned soul would be burning in hell, would it represent eternity? Certainly

not, for those figures are limited, have an end, but eternity has no end. Englishmen, who have the reputation of seeking pleasure and happiness, think of this: if you have not the Gospel faith, you will be damned. God says so.

Chateaubriand arrives at this conclusion in his philosophical discussion:

Christianity is perfect; men are imperfect. Now, a perfect consequence cannot spring from an imperfect principle.

Christianity, therefore, is not the work of man. If Christianity is not the work of man, it can have come from none but God.

If it came from God, men cannot have acquired a knowledge of it but by revelation.

Therefore, Christianity is a revealed religion.

—(Genius of Christianity, p. 685.)

It is hard to account for the existence of this world without its Creator. Pretty hard, indeed. Impossible.

It is hard to supply as pleasing, as satisfactory, as complete a system as the Christian system of truth which this world enjoys.

It is hard for any agnostic to give the world anything, even remotely approaching the grandeur, the greatness of the gift, that Christianity is to the world.

It is indeed hard to say that man would be so hardened of heart and blind of intellect as to reject the Creator, seeing that He deigned to come down on His earth, and talk to man in a manlike manner, and prove to man His assertions. Deluded must that man be that will not attend to the loving designs of God in his regard.

St. Augustin says: "No man denies the existence of God, but such a one whose interest it is that there should be no God."

"But the Lord is the true God; He is the living God, and the everlasting King; at His wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide His threatening." (Jer. 10:10.)

Persons in the 20th century have the same teaching authority that the world had on the first Pentecostal Day.

If adequate then for the spiritual needs of the world it is adequate today. If such were Christ's arrangements then it continues to be Christ's arrangement to-day.

"He that hears you hears Me." Why don't unbelievers hear this teaching authority?

"He that despises you despises Me." Why do those despising this teaching authority—those despising and rebelling against the Church—expect favors from the Master?

II.—BASIS OF REUNION.

"Without faith it is impossible to please God." Rom. 11:20.

"This is eternal life: That they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." John 17:3.

Christ is the Messiah—the Emmanuel—God with us.

Because the prophecies relating to the Messiah are fulfilled in Christ.

Because His own life and doctrine manifest Him to be divine.

Because He gave a Divine account of Himself.

If the Word of God counts for anything with His miserable creature man, then when He said to His Church—to His Apostles in their corporate capacity—that He would be with them all days, why do men deny it? Rather should not men be glad?

Christ came to atone for sin. The angel told Joseph to call Him Jesus because He was to save His people from sin. The most effective way to save people from their sins is to have them forgiven. Where in the 39 Art. is there a reference to the Sacrament of Forgiveness—the administration of Penance—the ministry of reconciliation? And sin is the chief thing that affects men here below.

If the truths of Christianity—the matters of belief, be 100, would it be proper to take the teachings of that sect that would embody only 90 of these truths in its creed, as a standard of Reunion?

In the basis of Reunion there must be no compromise with truth. Nor should those in error ask the standard bearer of truth to compromise. The custodian of truth has no authority to compromise it. If the custodian made a compromise it would be continually thrown in his face, and he would cease to be the custodian of the truth.

Let us be fair and impartial. Can Protestantism be the basis of Reunion? It can NOT; for it is not a building, but heaps of loose stones separated from the building; it is not a fold, but many warring camps; it is not a kingdom, but rather a conglomeration of rival, pretentious kingdoms, in none of which are the keys.

Americans are aware that Ephesus is regarded as one of the first four Councils: also that there was another council held there which Englishmen never regarded as a Council of the Church, because it was a meeting of those who opposed Rome. It was called the "Robber Council of Ephesus," the "Latrocinium," as it was pleasantly named by Pope Leo I. It was convoked against the will of the Pope, by Theodosius VI., at the request of Dioscorus, the rebellious Patriarch of Alexandria, and the well known heretic Eutyches.

Americans see that in 1492 there was one church recognized in England as the National one. This church maintained that there was only one faith, and that the Papacy was part of that one faith, and that the Papacy was necessary for the maintenance of this oneness of faith amongst men. Henry VIII, in order to get a new wife, was not justified in starting a new Church, and thus dividing the faith, as it were.

We want every good person to co-operate—heartily co-operate with us—in God's work for reunion. Especially do we ask those outside Christians—those not of

the household of the faith—to help. If you are not of the household, come along, set aside the straws that beset your path. We have the key. Apply to the Catholic clergy.

Saul of Tarsus was a good Jew, but yet a bad man. Why? Because of his faith. Hear himself "Who before was a blasphemer, and a persecutor and contumelious. But I obtained the mercy of God, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." 1 Tim. 1:13. Could the Englishman or Protestant generally in days agone plead that they did not know that the Catholic Church was the Church of God in England in 1492,—for the best, and wisest, and noblest so regarded her? When persons became blasphemous, persecutors, contumelious as was Saul of old, could it be pleaded that they were so ignorantly? Without pressing the question too closely, these lines are addressed to every descendant of a Saul, to do his best, in this our day, in his own circle, to advance the interests of that same persecuted Church; and to promote the one faith of the Master in charity and Christian zeal.

Persons should never forget:

That there is only one God and true knowledge of Him must be one like Himself.—Rev. D. S. Phelan.

That Christ is God and laid down His life in testimony of it.

That He did more than any philosopher or Oriental sage for mankind, for He civilized a brutal world.

That men believe their fellow-man in matters of fact and history. And if we believe man why not believe God—why not believe Christ who is God—God who assumed humanity?

The agnostic does not like to believe unless he sees. He does not like to be credulous in matters of faith. And yet D'Alembert, himself an agnostic, says: "None are so credulous as the incredulous." The agnostic believes the figments of his own depraved mind.

That even the evolutionist, claiming that beings proceeded from mere matter, must admit a first cause, a creator. For who made that original matter; suitably located it; endowed it with qualities (cohesion, attraction, etc.); gave it motion or animation, etc.?

Milner remarks that the pagans of old were so bewildered on the whole subject of religion, that Socrates, the wisest of them all, declared it "impossible for men to discover this, unless the Deity Himself deigned to reveal it to them." (Plato Dialog. Alcibiad.)

Chateaubriand says that Christianity is so truly the religion of philosophers, that Plato, the philosopher, may be said to have almost anticipated it.

"Would that one would come from heaven to tell us what is truth!" exclaimed this great Grecian philosopher, Plato.

"Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." St. John 1:17.

Hear Himself declaring before Pilate: "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world: that I should give testimony to the truth." John 18:37.

And before this He proclaimed "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." John 14:6.

And Plutarch long ago, still in the twilight, and still unguided by the Bright and Morning Star, wrote: "There is no greater gift for man to take, nor more august for God to give than Truth."

And although One came from Heaven, One not a mere messenger, but the Word Himself, and delivered this august gift of truth to men, two-thirds of the world today do not enjoy the truths of faith, because His unworthy followers have adulterated His truth and denied His faith.

Charles IX, King of France, once asked the poet Tasso who, in his estimation, was happiest. Tasso replied without hesitation: "God." "Everybody knows that," said the king; "but who is next?" And Tasso answered: "He who becomes most like God."

"For by grace you are saved through Faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God." Ephes. 2:8.

We find two Sacraments specially, that were prefigured, promised, fulfilled. And these two Sacraments are God's wonderful helps to men. And strange though it may seem, these two are specially attacked and rejected by sectaries. Would a Christian reunion be complete without including these —the Holy Eucharist and Sacramental confession?

"And I went up according to revelation, and conferred with them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but apart with them who seemed to be something: lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain." (Gal. 2:2). If St. Paul considered it prudent and necessary to consult the Church authorities, why should not Englishmen, who have run rather wildly, or perhaps run in vain, find it necessary? To the Council at Trent the Innovators were invited but refused; and after 300 years is it not prudent and necessary that sectaries would consult the Church authorities in connection with our present illustrious pontiff Pius X, who wishes "to restore all things in Christ?"

Eleutherius, from the East, becoming Pope officially introduced Christianity into Britain. The Papacy is the bond of unity. See!

Do you know any cause more worthy than the promotion of the dying wish and prayer of Our Blessed Redeemer?

Where are our cherished dead?

III.—IF WE GO BACK 1000 YEARS FROM A. D. 1492.

"Do not fear, but speak, and hold not thy peace. Because I am with thee." Acts 18:9-10.

"God is faithful: by whom you are called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." 1 Cor. 1:9.

"What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou hast made him a little less than the angels. Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor, and hast set him over the work of Thy hand." Ps. 8:5-7.

In 1492 the faith of England was the faith of Rome. To-day it is not. Americans are surprised at Englishmen saying it is.

Americans find the title "Sovereign Pontiff" given to the Bishop of Rome by Tertullian, an eminent authority, in the 3d century (245).

The treatise on the Sacraments by Watson, the last Catholic bishop of Lincoln, shows conclusively, if proof were needed, that old England believed in the Seven Sacraments.

With regard to the institution of the Sacrament of Forgiveness as well as the Eucharist, we can but exclaim: Only a God could do it. Only the infinite love of God for man could prompt such assistance.

Americans consider it woefully inconsistent for the Ecclesia Elizabethana to "order" her ministers to forgive sins, and prohibit confessionals wherein this power is exercised. Elizabeth herself commanded Ogelthorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, not to elevate the Host in her presence. (Lingard, under date 1558.)

"The elevation of the Host and Chalice for adoration was introduced in the 12th century as a protest against the heresy of Berengarius, who denied the real presence of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist." (The Continuity of the English Church, by V. Rev. Canon Croft, p. 20.)

"Filioque" was acknowledged as a fundamental verity of faith in 680 at the synod held in that year by Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, and his suffragans at Hatfield. (Beda, Hist. Eccl. ed. Stevenson, 1841, paragr. 304.)

Let us hear what a Non-conformist authority has to say relative to the pretensions of the Ecclesia Elizabethana to be Catholic and continuous from before the Reformation: "The argument that the Pre-Reformation Church was not Roman Catholic in doctrine, ritual, gov-

ernment, and subservience to Rome, is too childish for serious reply. In all essentials it was Roman Catholic, and the complete rejection of those essentials made the Post-Reformation Church an entirely new and heretical Church, that execrated what the former Church had adored; and believed and practised what the former Church had execrated.'' The Christian World (Non-Conformist.)

Britain was for over 400 years a colony of the Pagan Roman empire that perished. Augustine led another conquest—one different from Caesar's, and made it a part of that Kingdom that will last forever, whose center is Rome and whose circumference is the limits of the earth. And regarding the policy of the past,—the obliterating or destroying of that part as unwise and unhallowed, and unworthy of Englishmen, let the men of to-day cooperate in its revival and further perpetuity.

Schism, heresy, divorce, loss of Sacraments, multiplication of faiths and churches, these are some of the fruits of the revolution of the 16th century. That revolution not only violated the unity of God's faith, but it also hinders the pagan's conversion, and tends to unchurch people altogether. There are 50 millions of people unchurched in this country and credit it largely to such revolution methods.

One of the strongest signs that Anglicans have not the succession of pre-reformation Catholicity is that they dropped the belief in the Papacy; for whatever is once accepted as of faith Catholics never reject. Definitions of the Catholic Church ''last for all time without change or shadow of vicissitude;'' but a clearer, or fuller definition may be given if it is required or necessitated. If Anglicans were genuine Catholics they would to-day hold on to the old faith in the Papacy, and not accept a faith with one or more Catholic dogmas eliminated.

The Anglo-Saxon race esteem (or should esteem) Gregory their father in Christ and Bede their historian. This historian says of St. Gregory, called the Great, ''he made our nation, the Church of Christ.'' (Hist. Eccles. lib. 2, c. 1.)

Now this Church of Christ, called and known in English history as the Catholic Church, and of which His Eminence, Cardinal Bourne of Westminster, is an archbishop, is the one, the only one Church of Christ in England to-day. Americans have no evidence of any new revelation authorizing a different one.

Americans hope that Anglicans will not be displeased with the term "Ecclesia Elizabethana." It is not selected for the purpose of offense, but simply to emphasize the glaring fact that the National Church of England today is not Catholic. But those advocating the change of name of the Protestant Episcopal Church to American Catholic may say "We are Catholic and nothing else." Or Coronation Day the world witnessed King George V, swearing to uphold the Protestant religion. Now Angelicans try and find out, consequently, what are you really?

Sir Robert Hart declared in opening the Wesleyan Missionary Exhibition at Leeds in 1909 (see Synopsis for his exact words), that the Catholic missionaries in China were second to none in zeal and self-sacrifice. How sad therefore to find the Wesleyan brethren attacking the great stronghold from which this good for religion and humanity emanates; and associating with vile infidels to strengthen the attack! Attacking Rome holding aloft the standard of the Cross, is tantamount to attacking Christ Himself! And how utterly disedifying to see irreligious and uncharitable tactics manifested in the heathen's field—sects quarreling in pagan countries!

At the conference between the British (Welsh) bishops and St. Augustine was the Papal Supremacy one of the subjects for discussion? Not at all. The 3 subjects were: that the British bishops would keep Easter at the right time; that they would adopt the Roman ritual in the administration of baptism; and that they would join with the Roman missionaries in preaching the word of God to the Pagan English. (Bed. Eccl. Hist., p. 2, c. 2.)

In the celebration of Easter the British Church originally agreed with that of Rome, no less than in other

points, as the emperor Constantine expressly declares in his letter on that subject. (Euseb. Vit. Constant. p. 3, c. 19.)

But after the Saxon invasion, the British churches got into a wrong computation which Augustine wished corrected.

At first the British bishops refused to co-operate in converting the Saxons, as it was hard on flesh and blood to immediately and cheerfully volunteer to convert those pagans who had harassed them for 200 years. But this was not a denial of the Pope's general supremacy. Within 2 years we find Oudoceus, bishop of Landaff, going to Canterbury to receive consecration from the same St. Augustine; and ever after the bishops of Landaff were always subject and obedient to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was at all times the Pope's legate. (Rt. Rev. Bishop Milner to the Rt. Rev. Bishop of St. David's, Wales.)

Columbus a Franciscan.

Columbus belonged to the 3d Order of St. Francis. His crew also were Franciscans. America was discovered on the 11th of October, Octave day of the feast of St. Francis. They were Franciscans, that influenced Isabella (herself a Tertiary) to help the enterprise. The first clergyman to visit America in connection with the discovery was a Franciscan. The first bishop was a Franciscan, as also the first martyr for Christ in America.

The Franciscans were not only the first missionaries in those portions of North America settled by the Spaniards, but also along the northern coast discovered by Cabot under the English flag. Long before the Puritan Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, the intrepid Franciscan, Le Curon, had evangelized the Hurons and preached in the wigwams of the Mohawks. The Franciscan Father Hennepin was the first to explore the great lakes and give to Niagara Falls the name of St. Anthony. The Apostle of South American Missions is St. Francis of Solano. "The Sons of St. Francis," writes Leopold de Cherance, "were the first to evangelize Mexico, Peru, Paraguay, Brazil, Canada, and the whole West Indies."

"Pursuing to the last their work of deliverance and salvation, they were also first, with Juan Suarez and

Zumarraga, to raise their voices in favor of the Indians whom it was sought to reduce to slavery, as along with Ximenes, they were the first to protest against that hideous traffic called the slave trade.'' And thus our Abolitionists, emancipating the negro, were anticipated. (Adapted from the Lamp. Vol. VIII., No. 6, edited by Rev. Paul James Francis Watson.)

Two Anglican clergymen wrote that instructive treatise on the Papacy entitled ''The Prince of the Apostles.'' Since written one of them Rev. Paul James Francis Watson joined the Catholic Church, along with his entire community, the Society of the Atonement, Graymoor, N. Y. Their reception into the Church attracted national attention. The converts are happy. But let Father Paul himself speak:

''It is hardly worth while adding that the members of the Society have only feelings of profound gratitude when they consider the step of a year ago, eternity itself will not be too long in which to magnify God and praise Him for the benefits which have come to us by virtue of our citizenship in the Catholic Church.'' (''The Lamp,'' Vol. VIII, No. 11.)

Would that England of 1492 attended to these words of St. Paul: ''Continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and immovable from the hope of the Gospel which you have heard, which is preached in all the creation under heaven.'' Col. 1:23. In the 16th Century England listened to a gospel previously unheard, and observes it to-day!

''For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us.'' II Cor. 5:20. Ambassadors must be fully instructed with regard to matters relating to the power sending them—Christian ambassadors must be replete with Christian truth, else God will not exhort by them. What kind of a Christian ambassador is that who denies Christian truth—truth that was believed in England in 1492?

Heaven is the place of reunion in the love of God, in peace, harmony and joy. Hell is the place of hatred, disobedience, rebellion, and pain.

In your desire to promote your happiness you may have accumulated some riches. Now why would you not secure happiness which is infinitely better, and which will last infinitely longer than mere temporal riches? What will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul?

Does the authority that gave us the Scriptures as the inspired word of God—the Bible—that blessed and consoling literature—tell us that it is the sole rule of faith? She does not.

"Understanding this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation." (II Peter 1:20.)

Why do persons, claiming the Bible for their guide, disrespect this text and unlawfully use private interpretations?

IV.—UNITY IN FAITH NECESSARY.

"I and the Father are One." John 10:30.

"I am the Light of the World." John 8:12.

"I am the Way, the Truth and the Life. No man cometh to the Father, but by Me." John 14:6.

"And the high priest said to Him: I adjure Thee by the living God, that Thou tell us if Thou be the Christ the Son of God. Jesus saith to him: Thou hast said it." Matt. 26:63, 64.

And because He said He was God, He was put to death. It won't do to assert that our Savior was merely good; we must accept His testimony that He was Divine.

God made man a little lower than the angels. And man renders himself a little lower than the devils by sin.

Unity of faith requires a uniform interpretation guaranteed to be correct by the author of that faith.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Grosch, London, very truly says: "One unanswerable argument for the historic reality of Jesus Christ is living and before our eyes, and that is Christianity and His Church teaching it."

Heaven is the prize we all should try to gain, but we cannot gain sanctification without faith, for "without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. 11:6.)

We have unity of teaching, of creed, of worship, of government; because our first principle is admission of an authority, and our second principle is submission to the authority which we admit. Lucifer and Adam and founders of sects observed the first principle, but not the second.

"Rome exercised her spiritual power by the willing obedience of Englishmen in general," says Dr. Gairdner, "and that they regarded it as a really wholesome power, even for the control over secular tyranny, is a fact which it requires no very intimate knowledge of early English literature to bring home to us."

Truth admits no compromise. Anglicans *et id genus omne* are constantly asking for compromise. The Church cannot, should not commit herself to compromise with truth. It is sometimes alleged that Pope Honorius compromised with the Monothelite heresy, and every one knows that Anglicans are constantly throwing the case into our faces.

It is evident that the Queens Elizabeth, Anne, and Victoria could not boast to be "Defenders of the Faith" unless they expressed themselves in favor of the Papacy in terms similar to Henry's when he received the title from the Pope before his apostacy. Neither could the 4 Georges, nor any other sovereign of England. Opposing the Papacy and yet claiming to be its "defender" has helped to set English-speaking people in confusion.

Pagans naturally ask when they learn about individuals having separate Christian convictions from one another, "Has Christ made a personal, separate revelation to each one of them?" And they must be answered, "No, only one heavenly doctrine is revealed to men." But surely He made one revelation first to Catholics, and another one in the 16th century to Protestants? And the Protestant himself says, "No." No wonder the poor pagan remains puzzled!

The renowned St. Athanasius, the Greek Father, thus refers to the unity: "Whence the Gentiles, who confess not the same things, but are at variance with each other, possess not the true doctrine. But the holy and veritable heralds of truth are of one mind with each other, and differ not among themselves. For though they lived at different periods, yet do they conspire together for the same object, being prophets of the one God, and evangelizing harmoniously the same word." (De Decretis Nicaen. N. 4, t. 1, p. 166.)

Ephesus was the capital of Lesser Asia. St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians exhorted them to unity. Chap. IV. He mentions the various kinds of ministers "for the edifying of the body of Christ: until we all meet into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man." (Eph. 4:12, 13.)

One would think that nearly 1900 years since the Apostle of the Gentiles alluded thus to the building up of the Church the body of Christ, it is about time to have the 3 great nations of Asia, India, China and Japan, edified into the unity of the body of Christ.

"Here—'until we all meet'—it is plainly expressed that Christ has left His Church a perpetual succession of orthodox pastors and teachers, to preserve the faithful in unity and truth."—Dr. Challoner's note to text.

Helped to ruin the Faith.

Besides the axe and confiscation there were auxiliary causes that aided Henry's destruction of the Papal Supremacy.

(1) The Western Schism in which the rights of the Papacy were assailed.

(2) The Black Death which carried off 40 per cent. of the population, decimating the ranks of the clergy, secular and regular; thus necessitating the clergy leaving the Seminaries for duty without being thoroughly skilled in theology for the subsequent emergency.

(3) Loose autonomy conceded to some bishops which was prejudicial to the church in time of trouble and heresy.

(4) Corrupted Scripture. Versions of the Bible, corrupted to favor the views of the Innovators, were introduced into England.

(5) Individual vagaries, opinions and theories.

(6) The desire of officials for plunder from the confiscated property of Papal adherents. (See American Cath. Quarterly Review, Apr., 1910.)

What is Faith?

"Faith is a Divine virtue by which we firmly believe the truths which God has revealed."

Why do we believe what God has taught or revealed?

"Because He is the infallible truth and can neither deceive nor be deceived."

How do we know with certainty what God has revealed?

"By the authority of the Church which is 'the Pillar and Ground of Truth.'" 1 Tim. 3:15.

From these words of the Catechism we see how easy it is to know the truths of Faith, and know them with a certainty.

Sinner become reconciled to thy God. Have recourse to the ministry of reconciliation, just for thine own great benefit.

Oh, the sweet ministry of reconciliation! But kickers, rebels, betrayers, abusers, slanderers, blasphemers, mud-throwers, defamers, and other Church assaulters, such as the sectaries generally are, have not, should not have, this sweet ministry of reconciliation.

Man rejoice. God has established here on earth the ministry of reconciliation. One of your own nature has this wonderful office. Oh, how merciful is God to man. No wonder that the Royal Prophet asked "What is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him?"

St. Paul, speaking of the reconciliation of sinners to God, says: "God hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself . . . and He hath placed in us the word of reconciliation; for Christ therefore we are ambassadors" (2 Cor. v. 18-20).

To their eternal shame Americans see in English history that Englishmen opposed God's merciful plan of

reconciliation since the days of Elizabeth, banished the priests that had the ministry of reconciliation, and burned the confessionals—the tribunals of reconciliation.

Oh, the sweet ministry of reconciliation! Reader, do you believe that those disbelieving the ministry of reconciliation, and abusing the Church for exercising it, possess the sweet ministry of reconciliation themselves? If not, then find out where it is exercised for thine own great benefit.

If England were tomorrow without laws, or courts of law, or judges, or ruler; if it had no laws, nor authority to enforce the laws, how long would it stand? To prevent such chaos in the Christian Commonwealth we have a unifying authority in the visible head of the Church.

In her first Parliament Ware tells us, "Elizabeth took away the Pope's supremacy, put down the Mass, and for a general conformity of worship in her dominions, she established the Book of Common Prayer, and forbade the use of Popish Ceremonies."

If Englishmen—Anglo-Saxons—received their faith in Christ Jesus, through Gregory their father in Christ, and if he taught them the Mass, and its inestimable value, why do they reject it? Americans see that Gregory said 3 Masses on Christmas day, just as Catholic priests do in our day. What justifies Anglicans rejecting the Mass?

Catholics have altars as St. Paul had on which to offer the Divine Sacrifice, the sects have merely tables.

If Bede says that transubstantiation was brought into England by St. Augustine (6th cent.), why do traducers say that it only became Catholic doctrine at Trent (16th cent.)?

In mercy, truth, love, and omnipotence God says "This is My Body," and we bow down with the deepest reverence before this stupendous miracle. Eternal truth has spoken, the Omnipotent acts. The Church that received the words knows their depth of meaning.

The Caphernaumites that received the promise of the Eucharist, and the Apostles that received the fulfilment of the promise, are the ones that understood the meaning of what the Master so wonderously said. What meaning did the Caphernaumites take from the words of our Savior? That He was to give His real flesh and blood. They angrily said "How can this man give us His flesh to eat and His blood to drink?" And they went away and walked no more with Him. And He left them under the impression they entertained. And if this impression were wrong he would be bound to correct it as Divine Teacher. What meaning did the Apostles—did the Church take from the words of our Savior? Let the Church answer. Her answer is as emphatic as the Master's words to the people of Caphernaum. "In the first place, the holy Synod (of Trent) teaches, and openly and simply professes, that in the august sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible things." (Council of Trent, 13th session, chap. 1.)

History tells how England was severed from Rome and Henry made her spiritual head in 1534. This was repeated in 1559. In 1559 therefore was England again in Schism. Seeing that Elizabeth had "rejected the ancient worship, had supported a new worship and received the sacrament after the manner of heretics, Pius V. excommunicates her in 1570." (See Lingard under that date). Seeing therefore that the Pope excommunicated the Queen and all who participated in the new Church services; and seeing that already had Parliament declared that the realm was severed from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, Americans are surprised that Englishmen cannot see that they are in schism; and if in schism in the state of damnation.

For centuries marriage with a deceased wife's sister had been held by the Ecclesia Elizabethana to be incestuous and contrary to law. Mr. Justice Darling says: "It was bad since 32 Henry VIII, as being against the law of God. Yet bad in law not because it was always against

the law of God, but really because the statutes of the realm declared it to be unlawful, giving the King's and his Parliament's interested interpretation of the law of God, for a reason." Henry VIII wanted to put away his wife who had been his brother's widow, in order that he might marry Anne Boleyn. A way out of the difficulty was found by declaring such marriages to be against the law of God. To-day the judgment has been reversed and they are declared not to be against the law of God, remarks Rev. Father J. Ashton, S. J.

So Parliament said such marriages were against the law, and that they are not against the law. It is no wonder that Catholics ever maintained that Parliament was no authority in spiritual affairs.

No Parliament can repeal or cancel a divine law. But the history of the past 400 years shows many miserable attempts to do so.

In A. D. 239 Origen said: "Britain has one religion, the religion of Christ." Now, unfortunately, she has many.

Has the Church—the authority that gave us the Bible, said that the Bible contains all things necessary for our salvation? No.

Does the Bible say that it contains in itself all things necessary for our salvation? No.

Has the Church said that the Bible alone is man's true guide unto salvation? No.

Does the Bible say so? No.

Has the Church when she says "this is the Word of God" said there is no truth—no revealed truth, outside the Bible? No.

Does the Bible say there is no such revealed truth outside of itself? No.

Why then do persons tell the world yes?

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism." And one Church, one fold, one kingdom. In a peaceful spirit Americans ask that the insurrections and rebellions in the Kingdom cease.

"We have the mind of Christ." 1 Cor. 2:16. "There-

fore he that despiseth these things, despiseth not man but God; Who also hath given His Holy Spirit in us." 1 Thess. 4:8 .

We must do to-day as in Apostolic days: "And the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same recommend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also." 2 Tim. 2:2.

Now those that would reverse this teaching system, and, rejecting the authorized teacher, place a book in the hands of a person with instructions to pick out a little information for himself, are they not fictitious teachers, false prophets?

V—TRUTH CANNOT CONTRADICT ITSELF.

"For from God I proceeded, and came; for I came not of Myself, but He sent Me." St. John 8:42.

"As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also have sent them into the world." John 17:18. It is unthinkable for Christians, that He would send anyone against them, for He has promised to be with them.

"I will make their word in truth, and I will make a perpetual covenant with them." Is. 61:8.

"This is My covenant with Thee, saith the Lord: My Spirit that is in thee, and My words that I have put into Thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of Thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, and forever." Is. 59:21.

Americans are heartily ashamed of those who say that the Lord broke His covenant with His Church. Oh, no, the new covenant shall last forever. He made it in His Blood!

Americans wonder why our Savior commanded adherence to the Church, and warned the members against false prophets, if she herself would fall into error?

The Russian Church, rejecting the Papacy, stands as a criminal before the world, for she accepts the first 7 Councils, the bulwark of the Papacy.

Americans consider it funny that some Anglicans regard the Ecclesia Elizabethana as Catholic and some Protestant. After 3 centuries of probation it is about time to arrive at a certitude—which is it?

But it may be objected that the Reformation would make a sweep in England if Henry and Elizabeth never existed. It is quite true that a few might come in, but without Henry and Elizabeth the backsliders would never have been able to carry the nation with them. So says England's historian Gairdner.

Milner questions the sincerity of people: "How many imitate Pilate, who, when he had asked our Savior the question, 'What is truth?' presently went out of his company, before he could receive an answer to it!" John 18:38.

If we grant that the principle of private interpretation be right, then it was wrong and inconsistent for the leaders of the Reformation, or founders of sects, to intrude their views on others, as it was wrong for their followers to adopt such views.

If Englishmen regard private interpretation as the guiding principle then why do they adopt the 39 Articles that tell them what to believe? Americans see that these Articles of faith require an interpretation, and stranger still that it is not Convocation, but Parliament that is the final interpreter.

Jews should not refuse to believe in the Resurrection. They had the Roman authorities put Jesus to death as a criminal, as a slave, much to the humiliation of His followers. And yet He who died on the disgraceful gibbet was reported as risen from the dead a couple of days afterwards. Why was it not effectively contradicted? Why did not those who had sealed the stone, and set guards, produce His dead body? They could not for the tomb was empty. And thousands who heard the report of the Resurrection, and were on the spot to have it verified, became convinced and converted.

We have a divided Christendom to-day, but the Bible gives no sanction whatever to a divided Christendom.

We have various conflicting churches, but the Bible gives no countenance to conflicting churches.

We have a variety of faiths, but the Bible is emphatic in declaring there is only one faith.

Why, therefore, have we a "divided Christendom," "conflicting churches," and a "variety of faiths," when moreover the Gospel Church declares that such are unjustifiable?

"They delivered unto them the decrees for to keep, that were decreed by the Apostles and ancients who were at Jerusalem." Acts 15: 2.

Americans find that to England were delivered the decrees of the Apostles and ancients, from that memorable Pentecostal day when Peter proclaimed the truths of Christianity till Trent. These decrees bore testimony that Peter was the head of the Church, and the Pope his successor. Americans find also that England wrote over these sacred decrees the terrible words of Apostacy and Schism:

"We reject the Papacy although upheld by the ancients and councils."

"He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." Luke 10:16; Matt. 10:40; John 13:20.

Now let Protestants be candid, and be honest to themselves. In 1492 how did the Christian world regard this text? Well, let us take England. Unquestionably it regarded this text as referring to that corporate body known as the Catholic Church. This text is true now as then. And Americans see that those who despise that corporate body to-day are despising Christ. Then, as now, those who had become cut away from the Church by sects or schisms forfeited this right to be heard.

"But it is good for me to adhere to my God, to put my hope in the Lord God. That I may declare all thy praise, in the gates of the daughter of Sion." Ps. 72:28.

"God," says the Apostle, "hath made us fit ministers of the New Testament, not in the letter, but in

the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." II Cor. 3:6.

Sectaries manipulating the letter according to private interpretation are destroyers.

"But all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." II Cor. 5:18.

Where is this wonderful ministry to-day?

The world is Catholic at heart. The world after all likes the genuine and the true.

VI.—DIVERSITY OF FAITH AND CREED WRONG.

"For you have perverted the words of the living God, of the Lord of hosts our God." Jer. 23:36.

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Hearken not to the words of the prophets that prophesy to you, and deceive you; they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord." Jer. 23:16.

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

"By their fruits you shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

"Wherefore by their fruits you shall know them."
St. Matt. 7:15-20.

"There shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition." 2 Pet. 2:1.

"He that believeth not shall be condemned." Believe what? Apostacy, divorce? No. Well, what then?

Americans say to all those who yet hold on to the old faith: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith." (Heb. 4:23.) Would that the reformation leaders did this!

"For we are not as many adulterating the word of God; but with sincerity, but as from God, before God, in Christ we speak." 2 Cor. 2:17.

To be forever in hell on account of unbelief is an overwhelming thought.

The Spirit of Truth is to remain with the Church not for 16 or 19 centuries, but forever.

A good teacher uses a text-book for reference, etc. So does the Church use "the book of books—the Bible."

The New Testament is duplicate of the faith and truth impressed on the Church by the Holy Ghost.

Be sure you are right and then go ahead. If the Church was made right, started right, and assured that she would continue right, she must be right to-day.

The Anglican Church is not identical with the Church of Early Britain, Anglo-Saxon, Norman and of Tudor times up to 1534; for the Church in those times was built on the Rock Peter, not on human passions.

It is inconsistent for schismatics to deny headship to the Church, when they concede a head to the parish, to the diocese, and to the patriarchate. And this is all the more grievous when we reflect that the headship or chief pastorship is Christ's own special arrangement.

It is very foolish for Anglicans to talk of receiving the faith through the Gallic or French church and not from Rome, for the Gallic church itself was dependent on the Roman Church, as appears from the 3 historic documents that the Gallic church possesses giving an account of its existence.

If the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians was written to warn them against false teachers, Englishmen have disregarded that advice, when they apply the Scriptures to themselves, for they evidently have fallen under the influence of false teachers. This assertion is grounded on the fact that the English have been listening for the past 3 centuries to teachers, teaching contrary to what was believed in England as Gospel truth for 1000 years or more.

Great is the misery brought into the world on account of the sin and disobedience of Adam. By his rebellion this world became sin-cursed, and by the rebellion of Henry the world has become more sin-laden. Schism from the Gospel Church must be immediately stopped, for it is damning souls daily.

Fifty years ago it used to be said the Pope's Supremacy or Chief Pastorate was because of his temporal power. Now that the Pope has lost the States of the Church and is practically a prisoner in the Vatican, and his representative is denied a place in The Hague Tribunal, we find that his Supremacy is no way diminished. In fact it is stronger than ever before. What a spectacle to the world does not a united clergy and hierarchy in France present, in obeying the Holy Father to give up revenues, churches, and church property sooner than become a slave to the state!

We all know how our bodies are fed, or sustained by our blood. The part not nourished by the blood is either dead, or in pain. We Christians are members of Christ's Mystical Body, and we ought to be sustained by His Blood. We are wonderfully nourished in a spiritual manner by the sacraments that have their efficacy in Christ's Blood. But it is manifest that in order to be fed by His Blood we must belong to His Body—His Mystic Body—the Church.

By their fruits you shall know them. When a man does something bad his individual sin is an individual evil. But what about that man who advocates—promotes a system that perpetuates unbelief, what about those who advocate divorce and thus promote innumerable adulteries? Abomination of desolation!

Americans see that the past 400 years have been years not of brotherly love amongst Europeans generally and English particularly. There seems to have been born a new commandment with the deformation of the 16th century, "Hate your neighbor for God's sake." And this anti-Christian sentiment is strong abroad to-day.

"Desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither the things they say, nor whereof they affirm. 1 Tim. 1:17." Those desiring to be true teachers should go to the authorized teacher—the Church. She can solve their doubts. She is the custodian of eternal truth.

"Be not led away with various and strange doctrines." Heb. 13:9.

What led England away from the Church? Henry's marriage with Catherine. At all events it was given as the pretense. Parliament said such marriages were wrong; and Parliament now says such marriages are right. Oh, would that England heeded the Bible, advising all not to be led away with various and strange doctrines!

There is no certitude of faith outside the Church: just mere guesses or opinions: some members of a sect saying it is, some others saying it is not. Even in the Anglican church we find this uncertainty, e. g., some asserting of the Eucharist, it is the Real Presence, others it is not; and so on.

How very different is this from Catholic faith as laid down by the Church, "the pillar and ground of truth." Well does St. Paul declare about the certitude of Catholic teaching when he says "God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you, was not, it is, and it is not." (2 Cor. 1:18.)

If the doctrine about the headship of the Church, the Eucharist, the Sacraments generally, Purgatory, is different in the Ecclesia Elizabethana from what was taught in Canterbury in 1492; and different from what is taught in the new Westminster Cathedral, in the Apostolic succession, then Americans see that the promoters of such gospel are dead wrong and inevitably fall under Paul's anathema:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." Gal. 1:8.

National belief is crystallized in the coronation oath, and who will deny, that knows anything about English

history, that there is a modern Gospel prevalent in England, one different from the one prevalent in 1492? And if so does Paul's anathema hold?

"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith." (Heb., 4:23.) It is to be regretted that those men who posed before the world as reformers, disobeyed this scriptural injunction, and lost hold of the faith they already had. Had they held fast, Christendom would not be divided by the sects that bear their names.

Sometimes the ludicrous statement is made that at the Reformation the Church "washed her face." Let Dr. James Gairdner (non-Catholic) speak: "The immediate effect of the abolition of Papal jurisdiction in England was not a reformation at all, it was a grosser demoralization than before" (Lollardy and the Reformation, Vol. I, p. 380). "The Reformation in fact if we date it from the withdrawal of obedience to Rome, was really in the main an immoral movement stimulated by abuses to which Rome itself had been a great deal too indulgent." (Ib. p. 508.)

When the Protestant Bishop Walton said that no one can better interpret the Word of God than the true Church, and that the word of God does not consist in mere letters, but in the true sense of it, he said what St. Jerome had said many years before him. "Let us be persuaded," says this learned authority on Scripture, "that the Gospel consists not in the words, but in the sense. A wrong explanation turns the Word of God into the word of the devil; for the devil himself could quote the text of Scripture." (In Ep. ad Galat. contra Lucif.) So said Jerome, and who shall gainsay him?

Americans see:

That the Papacy is part of Christianity, yea the foundation and stronghold of Christianity:

That the head has as perfect a right to its place in the visible body as have the members:

That an administration authorized to see that the teachings of Christ be "observed" needs an administrator; yes, one that can speak and correct abuses:

In Catholic England the spiritual jurisdiction or ad-

ministration of the Papacy was never denied nor questioned ecclesiastically. Such statutes as those of Provisors, and of Praemunire, do not touch the power of the Keys.

That St. John Chrysostom says "It were easier for the sun to be extinguished than for the Church to fail." The same Divine Authority has constituted both lights to last till the crack of doom.

That it is shameful mockery of Sacred Writ to refer persons to its pages, speaking as it does of the establishing of Christ's Church, and telling of His abiding presence and co-operation, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit to guide her securely in the way of truth, and yet to find the same persons or authority in the Homily on "Peril of Idolatry," declaring "that clergy and laity, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects and degrees of men, women and children, of whole Christendom, were altogether drowned in abominable idolatry by the space of 800 years or more;" and furthermore to find the same persons enforcing this teaching and declaring in their 25th Art. "that this Book of Homilies doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times;" that it is time to have this shameful mockery cease. And as nothing is to be believed by Anglicans except what can be proved from Scripture, it cannot be proved that Scripture involves self-contradiction.

Persons should ever remember:

That faith is gained by hearing and not by reading:

That the New Testament writings are addressed to those who were already believers:

That those who reject Councils as useless are forgetting that it is necessary to safeguard doctrine by concilar definition:

That as private interpretation may be a perversion of gospel truth, St. Paul warned the Galatians against such innovation or perversion in these solemn words: "There are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from Heaven preach a gospel other than that we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:7-8.) This he further emphasizes: "As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema. (Gal. 1:9.) Now what gospel did the Anglo-Saxons receive? What

gospel did the National Church in England profess in 1492? Who has perverted the nation from that gospel so received? On their heads Americans clearly see that St. Paul's anathema falls. If Anglo-Saxons received a gospel setting forth the ineffable sacrifice which Englishmen called the Mass, what are we to think of a gospel which sets it forth as a blasphemous fable? (Art. XXXI.)

That if Protestants want to quarrel about power on earth to forgive sins, why don't they quarrel with Christ who gave the merciful power, and not with the Church that received it?

How can Catholics be called idolators for adoring Christ in the Mass when they believe what they were taught to believe by Christ Himself?

If our Savior was right and true, and if He started the Church aright, and promised her His presence and co-operation, is she not right to-day?

Where are our loved dead, and can we help them?

VII.—THE LIVING CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD

"A path and a way shall be there, . . . and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein." Is. 35:8. Even the illiterate are secure under the guidance of the Church. And guided by the Church, we are guided by God. "He that hears you, hears Me." Luke 10:16.

"I did not send prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied." Jer. 23:21.

"Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was." Heb. 5:4.

"The precious gift of faith shall be given to him (that hath not wrought iniquity with his hands, nor thought wicked things against God.)" Wis. 3:14.

"I will set up pastors over them, and they shall feed them." Jer. 23:4.

"I will not leave you orphans." John 14:18. Protestantism says He has deserted us.

"How shall they preach unless they be sent?" Rom. 10:15. Everyone knows that the Catholic clergy are sent for they have undoubted Apostolic succession.

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Matt. 28:20. Americans see that there has been a teaching authority in the world before the days of the *Ecclesia Elizabethana*, as since—and Americans recommend Englishmen to ascertain where it is.

The Sects are doing more to destroy Christianity than the Pagans.

The United States is the fourth Catholic nation in the world in point of numbers.

The zeal of the Apostles made the Church Catholic, that is the Church of the universe.

Others may assume to themselves authority to teach some truth, the Church has received authority to teach it all.

The rights, the power, the authority, the privileges given by the Master of the Church have not been amended, curtailed or suspended.

The Church is the continuation of Christ's own saving person—His mystic Body.

The first Eight Chapters of the Acts tell the history of the Church ere Paul was converted.

As we have the New Testament on Church authority, so also we have its interpretation; without her, neither.

We say in the Creed: "We believe in the communion of Saints." In this communion as in a family, we are all "taught of God" by the Church.

Surely no better interpreter of God's word can there be than His own voice, His mouthpiece, His "Church. He that hears you, hears Me."

Interpreting is not necessarily adding anything to a doctrine, and no one is as well qualified to interpret Christian doctrine in letter and in spirit as the Church that received the word and Spirit.

Christ demands of us belief in the truth. Who will tell us? The Bible—the Bible alone? Oh no! we see that the Bible alone, or improperly interpreted, is forced to tell as many versions of the truth, as there are improper, untruthful interpretations.

It is a mistake, reader, to think that the Catholic Church is mainly and solely for those calling themselves Catholics. The Catholic Church is for you, it is your Church, make it yours.

"Stand fast in the faith" (1 Cor., 16:13). But how can persons stand fast in the faith, and be loyal to the truths of faith, unless they know what these truths are. Hence the necessity of a teacher.

Others may teach some truths, but the Church—the Catholic Church—is commissioned to teach ALL truth.

Others may teach some truths mixed with error, but the Church teaches no error.

If it were incumbent on the Jews of old to listen to the prophets sent to them, it is surely incumbent on Christians to listen to the Church. "He that hears you, hears Me." And not only to hear the heavenly message, but also to receive the gifts, "for she is the dispenser of the mysteries of God." (1 Cor. 4:1.)

How glad Christians are when they can point out that in face of the greatest trials and oppressions the Christian Church has never compromised with error. This is because she possessed the truth. How different have institutions, founded on erroneous principles, confronted by

power, acted? Witness the Mormon Church proclaiming a new revelation, abolishing polygamy as soon as the U. S. government passed, and put into force, laws prohibiting it.

It is wrong to dignify any conventicle with the name and excellence of that wonderful saving institution, the Church. Only one Church on this earth enjoys that power and privilege, to teach exactly what Christ wants to be taught—the truth, the whole truth; and to administer these essential, these blessed sacraments, that have their merit and efficacy in the precious, priceless, blood of the Redeemer.

Every non-Catholic reading the Bible consults a commentary, an interpreter, some book written by one of keener ken than ordinary mortals. But what is surprising they never think of consulting the official interpreter, the authorized teacher, the Church. He that hears you hears Me." Moreover the Bible itself says, "No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation." (II Peter 1:20.)

Our Lord gave the world a sure guide, His teacher with whom the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, is to remain forever. This sure guide to truth and righteousness is referred to by the prophet Isaias in speaking of the joyful flourishing of Christ's kingdom; for the Church shall be a holy and secure way for even the illiterate, "so that fools shall not err therein." (Is. 35.8.)

If the Constitution of the Church be laid down in the Oral Word of God—in the words delivered by Christ to the Apostles, and if this Oral Word be confirmed by the Written Word, then the non-Catholic rule of faith that everyone can interpret this confirmation as he sees fit, is not well understood here, where the Government and its Supreme Court constitute the lawful interpreters of its Constitution.

Americans investigating the means left by Christ, the Teacher, to instruct those of the 20th century, find the means embodied in the word "teach" which He used to those whom He authorized to teach the world; and they are desirous to know why any one would devise different

means; and are at a loss to know on what authority such different means were instituted.

Christ in the first century said "Teach." Where in this 20th century do we find a teaching society or organization by virtue of that mandate? There are some disqualified to answer. All those who are members of a church whose *raison d'etre*,—whose right of existence, arises from the fact that they have rejected the teacher, and have depended on individuals to teach themselves, evidently have disqualified themselves to answer our question.

Is the magisterium of the Church, the supremacy of the Church to grasp with matters of faith, sufficiently proven to establish complete confidence in a person's mind? Answer the tests of 19 centuries and let there be no more doubt. Let that wonderful system continue to uphold unity in faith, in preference to the supremacy of the private, unguaranteed judgment of the individual —bringing endless diversity!

In very truth it was the false accusers of the Church that corrupted, mutilated the Sacred Scriptures.

Non-Catholicism, like the spurious mother in Solomon's wise decision, allows its children to be divided, and does not insist on unity.

The Catholic Church does not claim to be an authority on all truth, but only on Christian truth—revealed truth.

The sects—those cut away from the Church—have not the marks of the world Church, the Church Universal; for they were not **always**, nor are they **everywhere**, nor do they profess all Christian doctrine.

We must not be ashamed of Christ nor of His words (Luke 9:26). And if sacramental confession be something established by His word and authority, persons must not be ashamed of it, much less mock it.

It is simply wonderful how Christians have imitated the Arabian impostor in succeeding ages in trying to establish new Churches from the Book, discarding the Church, already existing, established by Christ, in Christ's own manner.

The Catholic Church is the Church of God. Her followers constitute the greater half of the Christian world. And when we see a Protestant aiding the rabble to bedaub and belittle the Catholic Church, we fall into an enquiring mood to know what is wrong with that kind of Christian.

There are deluded people in the world to-day—Freemasons, Jews and Anarchists who are opposed to the advancement of Christianity, who would fain destroy Christianity rather than advance it into the realms of paganism. And stranger, much stranger still, and far more wicked, is the action of so-called Christians backing up such diabolical tactics. But say this with hushed voice, lest the poor pagan may hear it.

"The Church," says Newman, "has ever been sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing and asking them questions; claiming to herself what they said rightly, correcting their errors, supplying their defects, completing their beginnings, expanding their surmises, and thus gradually by means of them enlarging the range and refining the sense of her teaching." (Development of Doctrine, viii.)

It is mere insanity for a Christian to say that earth is as much to be striven for as heaven.

There are, as we see, many Churches. But there is only one that helps body and soul, and that is the Catholic Church.

Convocation can deliberate and pass resolutions but it is Parliament that makes the laws, prescribes the penalties, hurls the anathemas. And yet Anglican parsons study pre-Nicene history to find precedents for their Church!

Reader, you wish to be saved, as who does not, and if you do, join the Church and square your life accordingly. "And the Lord increased daily together such as should be saved." (Acts 2:47.)

Catholics have all the sectaries have, besides a great deal more. Reader, if this religion for the entire world, called the Catholic or universal religion, has all revealed truth, why are you satisfied with only a part of it? If it is thus the best, and most complete, why not make it yours, especially when it was brought from heaven for you?

Americans consider it sublimely ridiculous for a few Anglicans insulated in the "tight little isle"—severed from Roman and Greek—from every Apostolic See, yet talk as they did in forming the 39 Art., imagining, calling and representing themselves as The Church.

The Church established by Our Savior although in the world yet not of the world, is a kingdom, the Kingdom of God, in which the Pope is the Vice-gerent. It is properly called a kingdom because it possesses everything required for a kingdom, namely: officers, subjects and laws. It is also called the Kingdom of Heaven, because it comes from heaven; Christ, the God-Man, having founded her; and because she leads mankind to heaven. God is the King, the Pope—the key-bearer, is His vicar, as we have said.

"If God has ever revealed anything about existence beyond this world of ours, if God has ever spoken, and if that message of God has ever reached me with complete assurance, then I should be a fool to call these things in question, whether the ideas coincided with my previous prejudices or not. I believe in these revealed truths, simply and solely, because God has revealed them. I place my belief in the authority of God, and this is an act of divine faith." So says Rev. R. Rateliffe, S. J. Manchester. The Creator has revealed truths to His Creatures, the Redeemer to those to be redeemed, the Teacher to those to be taught. Those truths constitute one religion for the world wide, just one for all nations—

the universal or Catholic religion. Those who lived in His time could hear these truths from His own Divine lips: those in the 20th century can hear them "with complete assurance" from that authority He established. "He that hears you, hears Me." "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." "Going therefore teach ye all nations." "He that despises you despises Me." "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city (that won't receive you)."

When Jesus entered on His public life we find Him challenging His enemies to search the Scriptures for they give testimony of Him.

We love to go over these texts that speak of Jesus—the Messiah, and see prophecies hundreds of years old fulfilled in Him. At the end of 19 centuries we love to review the prophecies and expressions of this same Jesus regarding the Church He was founding, and we have the supreme consolation to see them fulfilled. To be sure we see people finding fault with the Church, but didn't the Pharisees find fault with Himself?

Of course when we say that the Church is indefectible we do not mean to say that individuals, or communities, or nations, cannot fail in faith. And of course it is only quite natural, as it is quite wrong, that those who thus fall away will deny the indefectibility of the Church. The promise of indefectibility was made to the corporate body, and history shows that this promise has been fulfilled.

There are few Christians, if any, who are so insensate as to say that the Church had no right to hold the Council of Nice to defend Christianity; few who will blacken and falsify history by saying it was wrong to hold such a council; fewer still will say that Nice added to revelation. She simply explained what was already revealed, simply declared truth,—Catholic truth, and this is what succeeding Councils have also done. And those who say anything to the contrary render themselves utterly ridiculous.

Wonderful have been the trials and vicissitudes of the Gospel Church in the past 19 centuries. To-day we see her still militant. How gladly do we therefore read the words of Gamaliel to his fellow Jews: "If this council or this work be of men, it will come to naught. But if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it." Acts 5:38-39.

Every Christian admits that whatever Christ, whatever God unconditionally establishes or endows, must remain. But He established the Church known as the Catholic Church unconditionally, and endowed it with authority and therefore these remain. This Church established for you, endowed for you, why don't you enjoy its membership and benefits?

Americans may sometimes read of an Anglican plea, that the State Church has some ecclesiastical authority or jurisdiction, but this plea appears to be null and void in view of the oath of the Bishops that they hold the spiritualities of these Bishopries only of the Sovereign.

It is sometimes stoutly claimed that the present National Church in England is Catholic. How then explain that, so far as the influence of this National Church is concerned, Mohammedan, Jew or Atheist can get political preferment before a Catholic?

The devil quotes the Bible; heretics quote the Bible; evil men, in defence of their lives, try to give from Scripture a justification of their lives. There is not one of those sects that Anglicans condemn as Dissenters, but claims the Bible as their guide in their condemnation. Surely therefore we must have some authority to correctly show us. For if there be no authority, how can there be but one creed, or one faith?

There is only one Church that ever claimed to be the Catholic Church and that is the one with seat of government in Rome. The Greeks say: "I believe in one Church, of which I am part," and Anglicans take up the same cry. While the Church of Rome says: "I believe in

One Church, and I am that only Church, and outside of me there is no other." She is the only society on earth claiming either by right or by fact to be the Church, the Whole Church, and the Only Church.

If the Bible teaches anything sure it is that Christ identified His Church with Peter and that all are to believe in that Gospel Church as they believe in Himself, that He vests that Church with His authority, and that all must believe in it under penalty of damnation.

American Christians are horrified at the official version of the Church of England as to how Christ kept His word with His Church, for it is set forth in the Homilies "that all Christendom was drowned in damnable idolatry for 800 years."

The ignorance the sects have of infallibility is simply the quintessence of ignorance. We are told the Pope is "omnipotent," "omniscient," "divine," "impeccable," etc. Americans are amused at the "pronouncements" of some men who ought to know better about this subject. Thus Kingsley declared that the Pope claimed power "to create right and wrong."

Americans do not endorse individuals establishing various and conflicting interpretations of their Code of Laws, but rely on the Government and its Supreme Court for a correct and binding interpretation in case of doubt or dispute. Are the eternal interests of man to be considered of less importance than a few temporary concerns?

Granted that He said these plain words to that organic body—the Apostolate, "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven," the power is yet left in that organic body, not curtailed nor cancelled. Granted then that this power to forgive sins was given to this organization called the Church, and granted that this power was never recalled, it is in full force and efficacy to-day, and foolish indeed are sinners that will not avail themselves of this helpful power.

Everyone can see that the inevitable result of private judgment is destruction of a possible faith, or a positive belief; and filling the world with guesses or opinions. If there be only one faith, and if this faith is necessary to mankind, we can easily realize the wise arrangement of the Master in establishing the office of Chief Pastorate in Peter to secure this necessary unity.

There can be no justification for any sect opposed to the Church—the Gospel Church—the Church connected with Peter and his successors, except on the plea that Christ wants to break His promise, or broke it in the past. But as no Christian can admit this blasphemy, we must conclude the sects have no justification for their existence.

Magna Charta declared that "the English Church shall be free." Free from what? From Papal authority and jurisdiction? Oh, no. But freedom from the tyranny and greed of English sovereigns—freedom to maintain unimpeded her ancient intercourse with her mother and mistress the Church of Rome, freedom to elect her bishops without royal interference. And now that the sovereign is the spiritual head, that intercourse with Rome is impeded, and bishops have to swear that they accept the monarch's rulings in spiritual matters as final and that they must abide by Acts of Parliament as canonical decrees and such like abuses, Americans are inclined to think that a new Magna Charta is needed. (See "Continuity Reconsidered." John Hobson Matthews.)

Gladstone's Tribute to the Church.

Gladstone, England's greatest statesman in modern times, thus describes the influence of the Catholic Church in civilizing the world: "She has marched for fifteen hundred years at the head of civilization, and has harnessed to her chariot, as the horses of a triumphal car, the chief intellectual and material forces of the world. Her art is the art of the world; her greatness, glory, grandeur, and majesty have been almost, though not absolutely, all that in these respects the world has had to boast of. Her children are more numerous than all the members of the sects combined, and she is every day enlarging the boundaries of her vast empire. Her altars are raised in every clime, and her missionaries are to be

found wherever there are men to be taught the evangel of immortality and souls are to be saved. And this wondrous Church, which is as old as Christianity and as universal as mankind, is to-day, after twenty centuries of age, as fresh and vigorous and as fruitful as on the day when the Pentecostal fires were showered upon the earth. Surely such an institution challenges the attention and demands and deserves the most serious examination from those outside its pale."

Society is made up of the family, the state and the Church. Each has a head as it should be. The family should have a head. The father is the recognized head. The State, which is the aggregation of families, ought to have a head. The governor, or some such person, is the recognized head. And those who admit the desirability—the necessity of these headships, strangely deny a headship to the Church. It is well for the world that persons of such erratic, inconsistent principles, are not the guides of humanity.

Let us briefly review the fate of one of the old Catholic bishops, who refused to comply with Protestantism under Elizabeth, namely Thomas Thirlby, the first and last bishop of Westminster. Deprived of his bishopric in 1559, he suffered imprisonment in the Tower, dying in 1570. In opening a vault in 1782 the body of this Confessor of the Faith was discovered incorrupt, the face perfect, with a long white beard, the limbs flexible. On the head was a silk cap, and under the left arm a slouched hat with strings. The body was clothed with a cassock, the whole being in a wonderful state of preservation. (C. E. Ambler, in London "Catholic News," Dec. 24, 1909.)

As a test for salvation for those outside the Church —the gospel Church—the Church identified with Peter and Peter's successors, theologians prescribe an act of love of God. But can that be properly elicited by one outside the Church? Can a person truly tell God he loves Him, while disobeying Him, opposing Him, refusing to comply with His wishes? Can anyone who refuses to hear God's Church really love God? "He that hears you hears Me, he that despises you despises Me, and he that

despises Me, despises Him who sent Me.'' (Luke 10:16.)

''He that is of God, heareth the words of God. Therefore you hear them not, because you are not of God.'' (John 8:47.)

Art. XXXVII treats of civil magistrates, and declares ''the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.'' Civil jurisdiction he has none, but he has complete spiritual jurisdiction over the whole flock wherever it is scattered. He who owns the sheep gave him this authority. He has jurisdiction over the faithful, that constitute the fold, no matter in what land they may live. But let us admit that Art. XXXVII declares that the Pope has no spiritual jurisdiction in the realm of England, it would follow logically, consistently, and ecclesiastically that Canterbury had no jurisdiction outside of the realm of England. What, therefore, justifies Englishmen on their own principles sending missionaries to Spain, Mexico and the Philippines?

Catholic means universal, and how can we believe in a universal Church without believing that this Church is one, and under the direction of one head?—asks Cobbett, the English historian.

He asks another appropriate question. ''And if the (Presbyterian) Synod in Scotland can exercise its supremacy in England, and the (Methodist) Conference in England exercise its supremacy in Scotland, Ireland, and in the Colonies; if this can be without any degradation of king or people, why are we to look upon the exercise of papal supremacy as degrading to either?''

At the first promulgation of the Gospel, we find the word Church as distinguished from synagogue. And at Damascus we find the followers of the Gospel called Christians as distinguished from Jews. But no sooner did little churches start against the Gospel Church, no sooner did heresies and schisms arise to disturb the peace of the Church, than there was found to be a necessity of discriminating the main stock of her faithful children, to whom the promises of Christ belonged, from those self-will choosers of their articles of belief, as the word heretic signifies, and those disobedient separatists, as the

word schismatic means. For this purpose the title of CATHOLIC, or universal, was adopted, and applied to the true Church and her children. Accordingly we find it used by the immediate disciples of the apostles, as a distinguishing mark of the true church, as Milner remarks in letter 25. Evidently in the days of the Apostles themselves, the mere word "Church" was adequate without designation or qualification.

The Questioned Authority of the Reformers.

"To speak now of the Protestant reformers," says Milner. "No sooner had their progenitor, Martin Luther, set up the tribunal of his private judgment on the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the authority of the Church, ancient and modern, than his disciples, proceeding on his principle, undertook to prove, from plain texts of the Bible, that his own doctrine was erroneous, and that the Reformation itself wanted reforming. Carlostad, Zuinglius, Oecolompadius, Muncer, and a hundred more of his followers wrote and preached against him and against each other, with the utmost virulence, still each of them professing to ground his doctrine and conduct on the written word of God alone. In vain did Luther claim a superiority over them; in vain did he denounce hell-fire against them; in vain did he threaten to return back to the Catholic religion; he had put the Bible into each man's hand to explain it for himself; this his followers continued to do in open defiance of him; till their mutual contradictions and discords became so numerous and scandalous as to overwhelm the thinking part of them with grief and confusion." (See Milner, letter 8, for references. "End of Controversy.")

Directly and personally Christ gave authority to the Catholic Church to teach. Now who gave her opponents authority? Not Christ, for it would be unreasonable for Him to oppose His own Church—the one He established. Not the Church, for she could not authorize anyone to antagonize her, and violate unity. Not the Bible, for it inculcates obedience to the Church the Master established. There is not one chapter or verse in the New Testament giving authority to anyone to start a church

in opposition to the Gospel Church. Americans realize this and consider it as making a farce of the Sacred Writings when a man starts an institution which he calls a church, and quotes Scripture to uphold his conventicle.

"And there shall come a Redeemer to Sion, and to them that turn from iniquity in Jacob, saith the Lord. This is my covenant with thee, saith the Lord: My Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth, and forever." (Is. 59:20-21.)

At Pentecost the Church—the depositary of God's word—received the Holy Spirit. Peter was the spokesman of this Living Church of the Living God, and henceforth and forever do Peter's successors exercise Peter's office. It is incumbent on all who would fain believe that the word of God has departed from the Church, and that thus the prophecy of the heavenly Isaias has failed, to prove this beyond the shadow of a doubt.

How can persons believe in the Lord Jesus, and not believe in His Church, and in the means He has left in her "to enable men at all times to share in the fruits of His Redemption, namely, the Sacraments?"

From the Pentecostal Day to the present moment has the Holy Spirit animated the Church with a living soul; and constituted her the Living Church of the Living God.

What was the method of the Apostles—teaching orally, or having the people reading the Scriptures themselves? Of course it was the method established by our Lord they practiced. Numerous are the commands such as to "hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me in faith." 2 Tim. 1:13.

When our Lord said: "He that will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as the heathen," do you think He meant any kind of an imitation merely labelled as "Church," or the one to which He wonderfully promised His assistance and co-operation?

VIII.—SCHISM.

"These are they who separate themselves, sensual men, having not the spirit." Jude, 1:19.

"There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free: . .. . For you are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:28.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, to mark them who make dissensions, and offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learnt, and to avoid them." Rom. 16:17.

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, idolatry, . . . dissentions, sects, envies, murders, drunkenness, and such like. Of the which I foretold you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21.

Strange that Anglicans and Protestants generally abhor Schism and yet remain in it.

Persecution is a sign of the Gospel Church. What Church has been persecuted adown history?

The man for whom Christ specially prayed is specially attacked by Christians!

Schism—particularizing, nationalizing, is opposed to the universality of the Gospel Church.

The Russian Metropolitan, at the Council of Florence, accepted the decrees, as the Greek Bishops did.

Catholics in England are still subject to various legal disabilities. These are enumerated in the Am. Cath. Encycl., Vol. 5, p. 456.

Dr. Bellew, Methodist Bishop of Jamestown, predicts utter ruin for the Anglican and Greek Churches, which are doomed to decay as inevitably as the amputated limbs of any organism. He says this because these

Churches are in schism. So also is Methodism. And modern Methodism is assailing the Catholic Church, although separation from it constitutes schism!

Christ says: "Amen, amen, I say to you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (John 13:5-20); and he that is thus undoubtedly sent to-day is sent through the Papacy.

If the Catholic Church is then the Gospel Church, teaching the doctrine of Christ, it is evident that "Whosoever revolteth, and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God; he that continueth in the doctrine, the same hath the Father and the Son" (2 John v. 9).

The Catholic Church preaches the Gospel which she was authorized to preach. A different one brings a malediction. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a Gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." Gal. 1:8. Terrible malediction on the rebel "preachers."

Henry the Eighth's schism is just as condemnable as his debaucheries. St. Paul places such like in the same black list. Every one will say that Henry's debaucheries were indeed damnable, while some indeed say that his schism was commendable!

Ecclesia Elizabethana refers to church government or the power to establish and enforce such laws as are necessary for the welfare of the Church—in a word jurisdiction; for she talks about jurisdiction in Art. XXXVII.

It is pointed out by those who maintain that Henry's scruples over his marriage with Catherine were fictitious, that during the Sweating Sickness in 1528 the king when face to face with death sent Anne Boleyn away and lived in harmony with his wife. (Ling. p. 140, Vol. VI.)

The schism of Photius was healed. But Michael Cerularius, another Patriarch of Constantinople, started the Schism afresh in the 11th Century. One of the reasons he gave for believing that the Latin Church was heretical was that the Latin priests were not obliged to wear long beards!

So strong were the Arians, so much had Arianism leavened the Church that the saying arose "Athanasius against the whole world, and the world against Athanasius." Well, truth prevailed.

Russia requires of perverts the denial of the Primacy, thus formally heretical. This is in keeping with a Church established by a runaway from the Greek Church.

In the reign of Henry VIII the heretical Brown sent over to pervert the Irish wrote his protector, Thomas Cromwell, "I can make nothing out of this people; and I would return to England, only I am afraid the king would have my head taken off."

Shortly before the birth of St. Bede (673), Pope St. Vitalian sent the Greek Archbishop Theodore to Canterbury, as if to impress on England papal jurisdiction over the East, and as if to further emphasize on Englishmen at this time the authority of the Holy See we see St. Wilfrid of York appeal to Rome against St. Theodore of Canterbury.

Mohammed II, the first Turkish Emperor of Constantinople, placed Gennadius, hostile to the Florentine Decree of Reunion of the East and West, on the patriarchal throne (Alzog Vol. II p. 945), and be it said to the disgrace of Christianity, the patriarchs of Constantinople obtain their position from this un-Christian source to-day.

If heresy and schism are sins, as the Church, the Bible and the Fathers tell us they are; and if the violation of the laws of the Decalogue is also sin; then a person in heresy, or schism, or violating the Decalogue, ought to be rather slow in accepting the teachings of Wyclif for he taught that a man in mortal sin had no right to anything at all of worldly goods. (Am. Cath. Encyc. Vol. 5, p. 441.)

If it be true that Martin Luther testifies and calls God to witness the truth of his testimony, as Milner quotes in Letter VIII, that it was not willingly, but from accident that he fell into broils about religion, then no

claim can be set up that he was divinely commissioned to reform the Church. His was merely the authority of an erring man; and his co-reformers considered he erred and roundly abused him for it.

Strange that Anglicans pray in their Litany to be delivered from schism and yet persistently remain in it. The Ecclesia Elizabethana is the Church of the Royal Schism.

The history of the rise of the Greek schism under Photius, as that of the Anglicans under Henry, affords clear evidence of the Supremacy of the Holy See.

"Those who reject the jurisdiction established by Christ (in His Kingdom) are no longer members of His kingdom." (Cath. Ency. Vol. III p. 755.)

Americans see that there is no easier solution of the present damnable and schismatical question than for Constantinople and Canterbury to acknowledge now what they acknowledged before their schism, and on the authority of General Council after General Council—the Primacy of the Holy See *ex jure divino.*

The unity of faith is the one great bond of brotherhood which binds men together as the children of God, children of their Father in heaven. The law of love of the neighbor is implicibly rejected by the sin of schism as the Fathers tell us.

The illustrious martyr, St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, writing to the church of Smyrna, expressly says, that "Christ is where the Catholic Church is." In like manner, the same Church of Smyrna, giving a narration of the martyrdom of their holy bishop St. Polycarp, who was equally a disciple of the apostles, addresses it to "The Catholic Churches." (Euseb. Ecc. Hist. l. 4, c. 15, and quoted by Milner, letter 25.)

"Catholicism may hinder thought, it may be true, but it can hinder it only in those who were not made for accurate thinking." Thiers.

It is said in Sacred Writ that those rejecting the authorized teachers—those sent by the Gospel Church—that it were better for the Cities of the Plain than for them. How stunning must this consideration be to all those rejecting the Gospel Church and knowing how their own peculiar Sect has sprung up!

"As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you unless you abide in Me" (John 15:4). Anglicans are trying the impossible —a branch to bear fruit cut off from the parent church. According to history, England, in 1492, was part of the Mystic Body of Christ—the Church, now she is detached beyond a doubt. Come and be re-attached to the vine.

The Patriarch of Constantinople died at the Council of Florence (1439). He was found dead at his table, upon which he left these last words, traced with a faltering hand: "Joseph, by the mercy of God, archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, and ecumenical Patriarch. While I am sinking fast into the grave, I wish to communicate my dying sentiments to all my beloved sons. I admit all that the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ancient Rome believes and teaches. I confess that the Pope is the Pastor of Pastors, the Sovereign Pontiff and Vicar of Jesus Christ, appointed to confirm the faith of Christians." Darras. Vol. 4, p. 596.

Is there anywhere on record in the Christian dispensation that there is, before Heaven, one law for the rich man and another for the beggar? Has the Redeemer, who came down to teach us, anywhere taught that the king can violate the laws of Heaven with impunity any more than the man in tatters? The man in purple and fine linen ought to rejoice in his good fortune, and not contaminate these by abominations. But if, instead of being grateful to God, he defiles them, abuses them, is it not the privilege of the masses to censure the rich man's depravity? Has the rich man any more authority to declare the Papal Chief Pastorship unacceptable than the poorest man on God's earth? And to be uprightly consistent the masses should not wallow with the rich man in the mire, nor reject Heaven's arrangements.

One only fact ought to prove to Anglicans or Episcopalians that they are schismatics or seceders from what was formerly believed. The 12th General Council (1215) the 4th of Lateran, was required to explain the ancient doctrine of the Eucharist and defined the change of the elements "Transubstantiation." In this doctrine did England then believe, as being then a part of the Catholic Church whose head was at Rome. When, then, in the days of Elizabeth, the new English Church—the Church established by law—the Church of the Book of Common Prayer—the Church of Elizabethan Hierarchy—seceded in a body from this belief it cannot be denied that it fell into schism and heresy. Can it?

St. Augustine's Miracles.

A distinguished Englishman enumerating the most celebrated cases of miracles adown the centuries to the day of the conversion of England says: "The 7th century was illustrated by the miracles of our Apostle, St. Augustine of Canterbury, wrought in confirmation of the doctrine which he taught, as was recorded on his tomb, and this doctrine by the confession of learned Protestants was purely Roman Catholic." (Milner letter 23, and referring to the Centuriators of Magdeburg, Saec. 6. Bale. In Act. Rom. Pont. Humphrey's Jesuit, etc.)

Nay more, the miracles recorded of him, were not only recorded on his tomb, and in the history of Ven. Bede and other writers, but also an account of them was transmitted at the time they took place, by St. Gregory to Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, in an Epistle, still extant, in which this Pope compares them with those performed by the apostles. The latter saint wrote likewise an Epistle to St. Augustine himself, which is still extant in his works and in Bede's history, "cautioning him against being elated with vainglory, on the occasion of these miracles, and reminding him that God had bestowed the power of working them, not on his own account, but for the conversion of the English nation." (Epis. S. Greg. 50:7; 50:22. Hist. Bed., L. 1, c. 31.)

What may be Learned from the Bible.

But some person may say, "I have faith in Christ Jesus, for I have the Bible and I believe the Bible and all the Bible teaches." Well, let us see. In the first place it commands us "to hear the Church"—the Church of the Gospel—that started with the gospel—the Church mentioned in the gospel—the first Church, and the ex-

pression is heard "I will not hear it". (It is unnecessary to give the name of the first church for every child can tell you.) Then again, the Bible tells us of the forgiveness of sins by men in the ministry of the Church; tells us of many other things believed as of faith by Catholics, and although of faith will not be accepted by the sects. In the doubt as to whether it is of faith or not, who is to decide? Why, the Church that received the faith, that is the depositary—expounder of the faith, can tell conclusively of course. In vain do they read of a ministry started and recorded in the New Testament. The Church that has the succession of that ministry is rejected and they make unto themselves a ministry of their own. In vain do they read that it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah on the last day than for those rejecting the doctrine imparted through gospel ministry. (Matt. 10:15; Luke 10:12.) In vain do they read of Christ's appeal for unity, they persistently oppose that unity even in Christ's name, as if in mockery. In vain do they see God's plan for evangelizing the world as manifested on the first Pentecostal Day, they wantonly oppose that plan, and cause Christendom (outside their own little sectarian circle) to deeply regret the increasing diversity of faith effected through wrong, unauthorized and private interpretation of scripture. Sacred Writ tells such persons very plainly that there are certain things in the writings of St. Paul, as also in the other scriptures that are "hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." (St. Peter 3:15-17) and cautions them to be aware of the errors of the unwise.

If John Wesley in 1730 when in an unstable condition, when he was led aside by the errors of the unwise, by the errors of the Moravians, took heed and listened to the Gospel Church (the church connected with Peter, founded on Peter) as the Scriptures warned him, we may very safely say that there would be no division of Christendom by those called Methodists today, and the world would not be distracted by their disruptions, and the Master would not be pained by their opposing His unity.

It must never be lost sight of in talking of the English Schism, that a resolution taken to erect a separate and independent church within the realm passed into law March, 1534, and the kingdom was severed by legislative authority from the communion of Rome long before the

judgment given by Clement (declaring Catherine's marriage lawful and valid) could have reached the knowledge of Henry. (Ling., Vol. VI, p. 203) Elizabeth renewed the separation, and made it permanent.

Thomas a Kempis says:—"As often as thou sayest or hearest Mass, it ought to seem to thee as great, as new, and as delightful as if Christ, that same day, hanging on the Cross, was suffering and dying for the salvation of men." (Imitation, Bk. iv., chap. 2)

Oh how unhappy to deprive people of such faith.

Do you not hear the Lord saying, "where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them;" and where so numerous and diversified a people are united in faith and love, as 300 millions of Catholics are, is He not present?

"But we are not the children of withdrawing unto perdition, but of faith to the saving of the soul." Heb. 10:39.

Is crime the only justification that can be given for the violation of church unity in England? Shame!

IX.—THE FATHERS ON SCHISM.

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." II Tim. 4:7.

"For in one Spirit were we all baptized unto one body." I Cor. 12:13.

Anglicans respect St. Jerome. Well here is what he says: "No bishop was ever acknowledged to be a lawful bishop, except inasmuch as he was united in communion with the chair of Peter."

Since Christ so identified His Church with Peter, how consoling in our day it is to recall the words of St. Ambrose, "Where Peter is, there is the Church."

Our Saviour was the Man of sorrow foretold by Isaias who was to govern a universal spiritual kingdom. And as the life of Our Saviour can be written from Old Testament prophecies, so the life of the Church can be written from His. She is patient and silent in her suffering as her Divine Chief was.

Non-catholics admire Augustin whom Ambrose converted. They ought therefore ponder deeply over these words of Augustin. "I am held in the communion of the Catholic Church by the succession of priests from the very chair of the Apostle Peter,—to whom the Lord after His resurrection committed His sheep to be fed,—even to the present episcopate." (T. VIII, Contr. Ep. Fund. Manich. col. 269.)

Oh, how applicable to Anglicans are these words addressed to the Donatists by St. Augustin, the great bishop of Hippo: "If the Church should address you gently, and say, 'Oh, my children, what complaint do you bring against your mother? I wish now to hear from you why you have deserted me. You accuse your brethren, and I am sorely lacerated. When the Gentiles persecuted me, I endured many things in grief; many abandoned me, but they did through fear; but no one has compelled you to rebel against me thus. You say you are with me, but you see that it is false. I am called the Catholic Church, and you are on the side of Donatus.'" (T. 9, Psal. Contr. part. Donat. col. 51)

"Catholics now-adays make too much of the Church," has been repeated frequently since the revolution in the 16th century. Well, let us hear what St. Chrysostom (4th century) says. "For the Church is more firmly rooted than heaven. But, perhaps, the Gentile condemns me of boasting. But let us wait for the proof of these things, and learn the power of truth; how it is an easier thing for the sun to be quenched, than for the Church to be made invisible. Who, he asks, prophesies this? He that laid her foundations. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." This He not merely said, but fulfilled. For, wherefore did He found her more firmly than heaven? Because the Church is more precious than heaven. Why is heaven? On account of the Church, not the Church on account of heaven." (T. VI, In Illud, Vidi Dom. Hom. IV, No. 1, 2, pp. 141, 142.)

When we witness the persecution of the Church it would be well to recall the words of St. John Chrysostom, words that 18 centuries have verified. "There's nothing equal to the Church. Tell me not of walls and arms: for

walls grow old with time; but the Church never grows old; walls barbarians destroy, but the Church not even demons can overcome. And that my words are not empty boasting, facts testify. How many have waged war against the Church, and they that have warred against her have perished? But she has been raised up above the heavens. Such is the mightiness of the Church: warred against, she conquers; devised against, she overcomes; assailed with insult, she is made more resplendent; she receives wounds, but sinks not beneath the ulcer; agitated by the waves, she is not submerged; tempest-tossed, but she suffers no shipwreck; wrestles, but is not overthrown; she fights as a pugilist, but is not beaten. Why then has He permitted the contest? That He may exhibit a more glorious trophy." (T. 3, De Capto Eutropio, n. 1, pp. 461, 462.)

Protestants, schismatics that they are, should listen to the touching appeal of this same St. Augustin addressed to the Donatists, the schismatics in his day:—"Come, brethren," said he, "if you wish to be engrafted in the Vine, we grieve to see you be thus cut off from it. Number your Bishops from the very Chair of Peter, and in that list of Fathers trace the succession. This is the Rock against which the proud gates of hell do not prevail." (Psalm c, Donat. ix, 7.)

Cardinal Manning once said, "The old sanctuaries of England are indeed beautiful; but they have the beauty of a face from which the eyes have been removed." The lights of these sanctuaries are extinguished. They used to burn in presence of Him, Who is the Light of the world, reposing in their tabernacles.

The Ecclesia Elizabethana considers that the Bishop of Rome is head by ecclesiastical right derived from consent or concession of the whole Church, and that it is optional for National Churches to acknowledge such headship. Whereas the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the Catholic Church in England, the church of Augustine, declared this headship to be of divine right, and demanding obedience from all.

The Prophecy of Malachias and the Practice of Paul.

Have Anglicans gone back to Judaism? They regard the Eucharist only a figure.

"We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle." Heb. 13:10. What is this victim that those have no power to eat that have not our faith?

"We have an altar," says St. Paul. Now, where in the 39 Art. is there any reference to this altar? We regret to say that Art. XXXI. repudiates this altar in a sacrilegious manner.

Let us ask Englishmen in the inspired words of old: "What meaneth this transgression? Why have you forsaken the Lord, the God of Israel, building a sacrilegious altar, and revolting from the worship of Him?" Josua 22:16.

"Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins . . . Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was." Heb. 5:1-4.

Men must have a divine vocation to the priesthood—to the ministry at the Christian altar. And they are ordained, or authorized to officiate in the Christian ministry, in the Apostolic Succession.

"In every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation." Mal. 1:11. What is this sacrifice—this clean oblation, different from the rejected Jewish sacrifices? Not prayer, nor clean heart, for these existed under the old law. What then? "I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say," says St. Paul, and forthwith appeals for their assent to his belief in the Real Presence: "The chalice of benediction which we bless is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread of which we speak, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?" I Cor. 10:15, 16.

"For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come." I Cor. 11:26.

St. Paul (Heb. chap. 7) and the Royal Psalmist (Ps. 109) refer to Our Savior as a "priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech." At the last Supper

Christ officiated as Priest, offering up sacrifice, using bread and wine. This was before, and in reference to, the Sacrifice of Calvary. "This is My Body which is given (or sacrificed) for you." (St. Luke.) "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." (St. Matt.) "Do this for a commemoration of Me." The priest, obeying the command, and using His very words, consecrates; but a person not validly ordained should not dare to perform this stupendous ceremony.

"One section of our clergy," said the late Protestant Bishop of Liverpool, "maintains that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice, and another maintains with equal firmness that it is not. . . . One section maintains that there is a real objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood under the form of the consecrated bread and wine. The other maintains that there is no such presence whatever except in the hearts of the believing communicants." Americans consider such a church deceptive. They see that such a system of teaching belongs not to the Gospel Church. As Paul said to the Corinthians, "God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you, was not, It is, and It is not." 2 Cor. 1:18.

Oh what a wonder! To see Jesus the night before He was murdered take bread and consecrate it unto His own Body. Only a God could make the change and oh, wonder of wonders! greater still, He gives power to His priests to do the same. Great is our admiration at what the Savior did, greater still is our admiration at what the Savior commanded, when He gave creatures power over His Body. "Do this in commemoration of Me." Great as is the admiration of Americans at the wondrous mercy and power of the Savior, there is not in their language a word sufficiently strong to express their contempt for that preacher who without any authority, without apostolic orders, attempts this wonder of wonders—the consecration of the bread.

Malachias was the last of the prophets, in the order of time. He foretold the coming of Christ; the reprobation of the Jews and their sacrifices; and the calling of the Gentiles, who shall offer up to God in every place an

acceptable sacrifice. "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My name a clean oblation: for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts." Malach. 1:10, 11. This prophecy had reference to the Mass instituted at the Last Supper. This ineffable sacrifice—this clean oblation, under the appearance of bread and wine, was offered up on the Christian altar by St. Paul in commemoration, as do the priests daily on the altars wherever there is a Catholic Church throughout the universe. Daily is this sublime Sacrifice offered on Christian altars throughout the British Dominions from the rising to the setting of the sun!

Objectors and disbelievers—those who have not the docility of the children of God are constantly asking with Capharnaumites of old "how can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" We Christians regard all things possible with God, and we don't regard Him who created nature's laws as subject to them. His word is enough for us children of faith, nor do we stop to consider the "how." Let us hear the venerable Fathers of the Church speak on this subject:

St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: "Since therefore Christ Himself does thus affirm and say of the bread, 'This is My Body,' who from henceforth dares be so bold as to doubt of it? And since the same does assure us and say 'This is My Blood,' who, I say can doubt of it, and say it is not His Blood? In Cana of Galilee He once of His sole will turned water into wine, and does He not deserve to be credited that He changed wine into Blood?" (In Catech. 4 Myst.)

St. Gregory of Nyssa, In Orat. Catec., c. xxxvii.: "I do therefore rightly now believe that the bread sanctified by the Word of God is changed into the Body of God the Word, not so that by being eaten it becomes the Body of the Word, but because it is suddenly changed into His Body by this word, 'This is My Body.' "

St. Chrysostom, Hom. 83, In Matt.: "The things we propose are not done by human power. He that wrought these things at His Last Supper is the Author of what is done here; we hold but the place of ministers, but He that sanctifies and changes them is Christ Himself."

St. Ambrose, De his qui Mysteriis Initiantur c. ix.: "If Christ by His words was able to make something out of nothing, shall He not be thought able to change one thing into another?"

Shipwrecked the Faith.

"Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered up to Satan." I Tim. 1:20. What was their great crime? "They made shipwreck concerning the faith." (1:19.) Americans see that history tells of the dreadful wreckage of the national faith of England as professed in 1492. The sovereigns declared on oath that what was believed then relative to the Eucharist was mere idolatry. The Christian altars were barbarously demolished and the altar stones studiously desecrated. The confessionals were burned where the Sacrament of Penance was administered, and the land where the Mother of Jesus was specially blessed became the land where she was specially cursed. These are some of the wreckages, and the delivery up to Satan is something for the consideration of the wrecked themselves.

Americans see that in this word transubstantiation there was no coinage of principles. There was a coinage of a word to express a doctrine that existed in the Church —the Gospel Church away back to the days of Christ. To sustain their decision, Americans can quote the case of Berengarius 136 years before the word was officially used. This man was condemned in eleven national and provincial synods for his errors regarding the Eucharist and in the Synod held in Rome in 1079 he retracted the errors:

"I, Berengarius, with my heart believe, and with my tongue confess, that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar are, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer, substantially changed into the true and proper and life-giving Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

And because Berengarius attacked this Catholic doctrine we find the 12th General Council, A. D. 1215, accurately defining the doctrine, and using the word "transubstantiation." (Alzog, vol. II, p. 583.)

Englishmen, consider the words of St. Paul as addressed to you today, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name

of our Lord Jesus Christ that you all speak the same thing and that there be no schism among you." I Cor. 1:10.

Who was the priest or bishop who first said Mass?

X.—SOME FALSE CHARGES.

"Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ." Rom. 10:17.

"You have not chosen Me: but I have chosen you; and have appointed you." John 15:16.

"Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was." Heb. 5:4.

The trouble amongst Christians arises because they appoint themselves and *call themselves* regardless of divine authority. The result is—opposition to those divinely appointed and called; and hence diversity of faith and confusion.

"Amen, amen I say to you: he that entereth not by the door into the sheep fold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber." John 10:1.

Christ says, "I am the door". John 10:9. And we know He gave Peter the key. Again Christ says, "Amen, amen I say to you, I am the door of the sheep". John 10:7. And we know He gave His sheep in charge of Peter. No wonder Old England honored Peter.

What essential doctrine of apostolic days has the Church cancelled?

We sometimes hear the expression, what the East and West—the undivided Church declared was true. But the undivided Church declared for the headship of the Papacy.

It is no wonder that Protestants would try to belittle the infallibility of the Church; for if an infallible authority declares them wrong where is their defense?

In the Catholic Church the Decrees of Trent and the Vatican are, of course, as irrevocable as those of Nice and Chalcedon. Why not?

The English Lord Chief Justice Coleridge has well put it. "The Established Church is a political institution,

established, created, and protected by law, absolutely dependent on Parliament.''

In the midst of his abuse of the clergy, Wycliffe maintained ''that the Pope is highest Vicar Christ has here in earth.'' (M. S. of prelates, Apud Lew. p. 129.)

Referring to Wycliffe, Lingard says that ''in common with other religious innovators, he claimed the two-fold privilege of changing his opinion at will, and of being infallible in every change.'' (Lingard under date A. D. 1382.)

Strange that Anglicans persons, having rich benefices, would be lauding Wycliffe, for he maintained that clergymen ought to have no sort of temporal possessions. If he were a true reformer, why are not all his teachings accepted?

Americans hope that as King Edward removed ''Defender of the faith'' from the coins because he was merely a defamer of the faith on oath; so also King George ought to have removed from the Prayer Book the belief in the first four councils, because the Papacy, which these councils upheld, is abused and defamed in Anglican circles, not for a day but for the past three centuries.

On the principle that the Catholic Church is today the saving church, Anglicans claim to be a branch of it, for ''there is nothing necessary for salvation prohibited, nothing destructive to salvation enjoined, by the Church of Rome.'' (Thorndike's ''Epilogue,'' p. 146.)

That Mass was said in Rome when Augustine came to England is evident from one of St. Gregory's Homilies for Christmas Day, ''Since'' he says, ''God is willing I shall say Mass thrice today, I cannot be very long in discourse upon the Gospel.''

Catholics recognize that Christ is their King. He is the Ruler in that ''Kingdom not of this world'' although

the members belong to this world. Christ is head of that Kingdom or Church, in heaven, on earth and in purgatory, But Catholics believe in Christ's own arrangements in giving Peter authority in the Kingdom by giving him the keys, empowering him to act as head, as His vicar, here on earth.

The Anglican Archbishop Temple in his reply to the Encyclical of Leo XIII acknowledges "the divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians to be a fact of revelation." If this then be a matter of faith, as it is, then Protestantism is self-condemned, for its disunited and warring sects are evidently not carrying out "the divine purpose of visible unity."

There is Christianity and there are erroneous views of Christianity. No one ought to be persuaded that erroneous views of Christianity ought to be adopted, whether these views arise from private interpretation from within, or from the pagan without.

Mahommedan persecutors of Christianity compelled their captives to trample on the cross as a pledge of fidelity to Islam. Then it was considered that they would never more return to the love of the cross and Him crucified. No wonder that some Christians inherit a hatred for the crucifix, for the same trampling tactics were practiced by one set of Christians against the other, a few centuries ago. We refer the reader to English histories.

If God will damn us for not believing, He surely has left us an infallible teacher to tell us for a certainty what we must believe. This teacher is either the Catholic Church or the Protestant Church. The Bible—a dumb book—which can be interpreted any way, is not a living guide. Are the Protestant churches infallible? Is any one of them infallible? Which one?

Zuingle was one of the Reformers. He thus writes Luther, concerning his corrupt translation of the Scriptures, "Thou corruptest the word of God, O Luther; Thou art seen to be a manifest and common corrupter and perverter of the Holy Scripture; how much are we ashamed of thee, who have hitherto esteemed thee beyond all measure, and proved thee to be such a man." (Zuing. t. 2, ad. Luth., lib. de S.)

"The English nation would not identify itself with the Tridentine reform, but must needs have a brand new reform of her own—an English Reformation, a godly Reformation. Unhappily, the English nation had for its ruler at the time a monarch whose abominable lust and atrocious tyranny have since become a by-word. Henry VIII. is called by Burnett the first-born son of the great and glorious Reformation, but to any respectable mind the career and character of this first-born son would be enough to discredit any Reformation." ("Has the Reformation Reformed Anything?" P. 132-133.)

Americans see that the Tridentine enactments are lasting and effective, while the Anglican reformation was a mighty poor job. Even the Non-conformists seem to be taking the business out of the hands of Anglicans.

If any Church has the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus it must be the first Church. If the first Church failed, then there is no genuine Christian church. Christ promised to be with the first Church—the Gospel Church—the Catholic Church. If He were with this Church, evidently she could not teach error. It cannot be proved that the Church taught error, and that she had to be reformed on lines of doctrine. Is it not blasphemy to say that Christ failed to keep His promise? If He failed to keep His promise, as Anglicans falsely assert, why then Christianity is a failure, and if so why should the heathen embrace it? Hence it is evident that Protestantism is the great obstacle to the conversion of the heathen.

The Council of Lateran of 1215 called the change in the sacramental species transubstantiation. We find no Convocation rejecting the term. In 1492 it was the belief of England, as part of the Catholic Church there. Art. VIII gives the official belief of the National Church of England in Catholic creeds. And some of its members claim that they have a continuity of doctrine with the Church of 1492. And yet were we not all witnesses of the agitation over the obnoxious Coronation Oath? Such unwarranted claims of continuity are hurtful to the sincerity and veracity of Englishmen in the eye of Americans. It is time to have such claims abandoned in the cause of truth.

Americans see that the arguments of St. Cyprian in favor of unity and union with Rome are overwhelming, yet in face of all these, Anglicans make use of what he said in a moment of anger and in the heat of discussion. In the matter discussed it is conceded that the Pope was right. Why therefore take the wrong side in this issue? Evidently St. Cyprian repaired his offense ere his death. For the authority against which he offended placed his name amongst the saints in the canon of the Mass. Let St. Augustin speak on the matter. He said, "He cannot doubt of the return of this great man to the truth, although the authentic proofs of it were suppressed, probably by those who, possessed by the same error, were unwilling to be deprived of such patronage." (Darras, Vol. I., page 259.)

Protestants Should Remember:

That the Church cannot be duplicated till the second birth of Christ.

That man can no more make a Christian Church than create a world.

That what was *de fide* in A. D. 1492 is surely *de fide* to-day.

That the God of truth cannot endorse contradictory sects.

That a Church on State authority is not the same as the Church of God.

That as Christ, the founder, was visible so is the teacher in the institution founded, and so are those who are to be taught.

That there is one authorized message from on high and one authorized teacher of it—not two teaching churches.

That to assert that the Gospel Church—the church connected with St. Peter, failed in faith is an impeachment of the veracity of the Master and is implied blasphemy.

That a branch separated from the trunk, as the Anglican Church separated from Rome claims to be, and yet having life, is truly a phenomenon.

That the Papacy is the source, the center and the efficient cause of the unity of the faith. Without the Pope the Church cannot be one; that is, it cannot be distin-

guished by that Divine Unity for which Christ prayed, for the Papacy is to the Church what the "hub is to the wheel," as Rt. Rev. John S. Vaughan, D. D. tersely expresses it.

That as at Jerusalem it was Peter and those in Communion with him; so, also, at the Council of Trent and the Vatican it was those in communion with the Pope that constituted the Church, the Gospel Church, the Church which was to settle all controversies.

That "Go teach all nations" does not mean that people will go and teach themselves. To be sure Catholics wrote the New Testament, but that does not preclude the Teacher, nay, the New Testament bears evidence to the office and necessity of the Teacher. A professor writing a treatise does not intend that schools are to be closed.

"To believe in a Church is to believe in the Pope," declared the illustrious Newman. If this is so, Protestants considering themselves Christians, and hence believers in a Church, ought to attentively read these pages calling attention to the Papacy.

Americans see that if Christ conferred power, and authority, and mission on the Church, He alone can recall such. And yet there is no record of such revocation.

Those sent by the Catholic Church can apply the test: "He that knoweth God heareth us. He that is not of God heareth us not." (1 John 4:6.)

Hearing *ad nauseam* that the Catholic Church is opposed to the Bible, let us ask would we have the New Testa ment at all were it not for the Church? And let it be emphasized; the Church is the loyal champion of the Bible today.

Items From the Catholic Press.

"Nobody nowadays," says an English politician, whose father was a Nonconformist minister. "save a handful of vulgar fanatics, speaks irreverently of the Mass."—Montreal Gazette.

The real presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist was the faith of Luther and Melancthon and those who claim to be heirs of Luther's doctrine owe it to themselves to examine carefully the grounds for the traditional Christian teaching concerning the great mystery of the Lord's Supper. (New World, Vol. XIX, No. 4.)

Says "The Advance" Congregational: "The Pope is trying to navigate the twentieth century sea in a fifteenth century boat."

The Pope is sailing, brother Advance, in that seaworthy boat, the bark of Peter, that has weathered the storms of nineteen hundred years. Her rigging is faith, her compass the words of Christ, her pilot the successor of the Fisherman, and her port the beauteous Shores of the Blessed. "The New World," Chicago.

What Luther Taught.

Luther and Zwingle, we are told, says the "Toronto Catholic Register" met at Marburg. They agreed on all points but the Lord's Supper. The controversy was long and bitter. Luther insisted on the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Zwingle denied. Agreement being impossible, Zwingle turned to Luther and said: "Martin Luther, while we hold the grand doctrine of salvation by faith we cannot consent to differ about minor points." He reached out his hand to Luther, but the father of the Reformation refused the outstretched hand and avowed that he would hold no communion with anyone who would deny the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Words of Praise from the Mayor of Tokio.

Before a gathering of Japanese savants lately gathered in Tokio, the Mayor, in a welcoming address, said:

"Last year, 1909, Dr. Anezaki Masaha, professor of comparative religion at the University of Tokio, made a journey through Europe in order to become better acquainted with the Catholic Church and her religious orders. In the course of a lecture on the results of his observations he declared that, to the best of his knowledge, 'the Catholic Church is the most powerful, the most perfect and the most sublime institution with which the history of mankind is acquainted.' Because of its insistency on the principle of authority, he added, the Catholic religion is the one to be recommended to the Japanese. He then spoke with reverential admiration of the saints, whose ethical ideals were indispensable, especially in an age so strongly tinged with materialism as ours. 'A saint,' he said, 'is a necessary factor even in social progress. . . . The silent but mighty influence which goes out from the religious orders, and the services they have done to society are incalculable.'

"The study of the personality and the life work of St. Francis of Assisi made a deep impression on Dr.

Masaha. He obtained permission from the Vatican to visit the mother house of the Poor Clares in Rome. The mother superior he described as a woman of 'great enlightenment,' who discussed the deepest questions with the most touching simplicity. He also visited several houses of the Lazarists, Dominicans, Benedictines and Franciscans. 'I found the life within the cloister walls,' he writes, 'radiant with joy beyond expectation. In a certain class of books we read much about the corruption of the monasteries. It will be well to meet such accusations with distrust, as they are generally made by apostate members. The pleasant, wide-awake character and the open-heartedness of the religious with whom I became acquainted impressed me most favorably. I have found many good friends amongst them, and I correspond with some of them still. If we look only at the Franciscan monasteries we feel that the spirit of Christianity is by no means approaching dissolution. On the contrary, if we look at Buddhism we see with regret that its once flourishing monastic life has woefully declined.' ''—''Western Watchman,'' Vol. 45, No. 27.

XI.—IS THE PAPACY BASED ON SCRIPTURAL GROUNDS?

''And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them.'' Ezech. 34:23.

''Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.'' Eph. 4:3.

''But you do not believe: because you are not of My sheep. My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me.'' John 10:26, 27.

Christians know that Christ entrusted His sheep to Peter as Chief Pastor. For centuries England was foremost in recognizing the Chief Pastorate thus divinely appointed. Why not listen to the voice from that Pastorate to-day?

St. Peter suffered martyrdom. So did his 34 immediate successors. Here is extraordinary loyalty and testimony towards the Good Shepherd.

As where Peter is there is the Church, so where the Church is there is Christ, its Founder.

In the mandate to Peter, "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep," our Savior retains the proprietorship of the flock, that He requires Peter to feed.

St. Paul does not allude to our Lord as Head of the Churches, but of *the Church.*

The mission of the Church was directed to the two great divisions of mankind—the Jew and the Gentile, and to both did St. Peter *first* announce the Gospel.

There have been holocausts amongst the poor Christians in the Turkish Empire, to atone, let us hope, for the crime of the Patriarch of Constantinople siding with the political party against the Vicar of Christ.

"Then after three years I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him 15 days." (Gal. 1:18). Why did Paul come up to see Peter especially?

What is it that constitutes an independent Church, or part detached from the mystical body, and what authority is there for it in Scripture?

There was need under the Old Law of 99 Pontiffs who succeeded to the chair of Moses. Since the coming of Christ, the world needed those men, who have filled the chair of Peter; and the world will need the office of the Chief Pastorate as long as men survive.

We see in St. Matt. 16:18 and in St. John 21:15, an office established by Jesus Christ for the benefit of the Church, and like herself perpetual. He who has succeeded in this office according to all history and tradition is the Roman Pontiff.

"The ablest defenders of Gregory VII (Hildebrand) have been Protestants," remarks Rev. Dr. M. O'Riordan. "Hurter was a stern Protestant when he began his well-

known work 'Pope Innocent III and His Times;' but his opinion of the mediaeval Popes and the Papacy so changed in the course of his researches, that shortly after the publication of it he was received into the Catholic Church."

Americans recognize that Catholics regard Christ as their Founder. He is the Eternal Truth and they regard Him as their Way, Truth and Life. So also in talking of foundations, He is the chief cornerstone. But when our Savior speaks of Himself, as a builder, He refers to Peter as the material.

Seeing, too, that Christ is the foundation set by the Father, when we regard Christ as a Builder, He builds, as He Himself says, on Peter. Peter is the first Christian. The faith-confessing Peter is the commencement of the Church.

Art. XXX reads: "That person who by open denunciation is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken, of the whole multitude, as an Heathen and Publican, unless he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto."

Americans regard this Article as extraordinary inasmuch as it bears testimony to Anglican excommunication, and affords testimony for our Appeal. We have repeatedly and emphatically laid down that, according to English history, the Catholic Church was the National Church of England in 1492. Henry and Elizabeth openly denounced that Church, and both were rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, as are all partaking in their heretical and schismatical worship.

Americans find:

That a prayer offered fo Peter sufficed for the Church, for Peter was the foundation.

That to Peter alone did Christ give the keys. Peter alone is called the Rock. Mark well that both these metaphors applied to His Vicar are applied to Christ Himself also.

That Pius X deprived of his temporalities is as much a Pope as Hildebrand (St. Gregory VII) who excommun-

icated Henry IV, king of Germany and Italy, candidate for the Roman Empire, on a count of his sacrilegious usurpations and unbridled violence against the Head of the Church.

That Gladstone in his comment on Anglican orders referred to the Pope as the first bishop in Christendom.

That the dogmatic Epistles of the Popes were never submitted to juridical examination in a General Council. (Parsons 1, 284, 480.)

That false are the charges that the Papacy was established in the 7th Century or that it came from bishops or councils.

That if the three patriarchates existent at Nice were patriarchates because of Peter's connection with them, because it was a Petrine arrangement; Antioch because he was bishop there *in transitu*, and Alexandria because founded by his disciple Mark, and Rome because of his permanent See, then it is unreasonable to deny Peter's superiority.

That in the revolution of the 16th century authority and vested rights to teach were utterly disregarded in religious matters, so to-day in secular matters we see authority and vested rights attacked by Socialists.

That Anglicans ought to be ashamed to attribute jurisdiction to Rome merely because it was the capital, for they contradict this in their own practice, never conceding as much honor to the See of London as to Canterbury.

That we are living in a strange day when Augustine whom Bede declared to be the Apostle of England is denied the honor and that Englishmen thus denying don't know who is their father in God.

That it is not a question of a number of churches with equal authority to teach, but *one only Church* with divine authority.

That it is not a mere Episcopal question of a bishop having authority over his fellow bishops, but the question of the See of the Apostle—the Apostolic See of Peter over the episcopate that flows from the Apostolate, and moreover the authority of the Apostolic See that exercised authority over other Apostolic Sees, that we have to consider.

That if Christ had not proved His mission to the Jews there would be no sin in thus rejecting Him. "If I had not done amongst them what no other man had done, they would not have sin." (St. John 15:24.) And this is precisely what constitutes the damning sin of the rebels to the Gospel Church—the one identified with Peter, that they have not, nor cannot give, any sign from Heaven to sanction their disobedience.

The Council of Nice, the first General one, gives us the key regarding the Papal Supremacy.

It is the Pope's office to assemble a General Council. (The civil power may act in concert in bringing the Bishops together.)

It is his office to preside at the Council in person or by legates.

It is his office to give his assent to the canons of the Council before they become valid.

It endorsed Popes Victor and Stephen against the bishops holding different opinions, thus sanctioning the Papal authority outside of its own Diocese, its own Patriarchate, and the correct explanation of the faith by Rome, thus favoring the Infallibility.

It testified that the Roman See always had the Primacy. (See Part II, for quotations in corroboration.)

Non-Catholic Testimony.

"Now it on all hands is agreed that St. Peter came out of the East to Rome, etc." (Collier's Hist., Vol. I, p. 12.)

"No true Christian will deny that St. Peter was in Rome." (Grotius in 1 Petr. v. 13.)

"On account of the unanimous testimony of historical writers, I do not dispute that St. Peter died in Rome." (Calvin Instit. 50.)

Churches may be established and disestablished by individuals, but the Church of God—the Church established on Peter by the Divine Master Himself, goes on forever. It is very rash of man to try to destroy God's work.

"I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to resist nor gainsay." Luke 21:15.

"To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God." Mark 4:11; Matt. 13:11; Luke 8:10. All this wisdom is concentrated in the Church. The Papacy is the custodian.

Is it not strange contradiction to the principle of private interpretation that Protestants learn Protestantism, not from the Bible, but from Protestant ministers and preachers? A man is a Lutheran because he accepts the interpretation of a Lutheran clergyman; or is a Presbyterian because he accepts the teaching of his clergyman or church; and so on.

"Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day, and all the night, they shall never hold their peace. You that are mindful of the Lord, hold not your peace." Is. 62:6.

"Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me; that they may be one, as we also are." John 17:11.

Did Christ Himself write a Bible as a rule of faith; and if not, why not?

XII.—DOES THE CHURCH MAINTAIN THAT THE PAPACY IS SCRIPTURAL?

"(Peter) Confirm thy brethren." St. Luke 22:32.

"That which is common to us both, your faith and mine." Rom. 1:12.

The New Testament gives historic evidence to the establishing of the Church, before the New Testament was written.

It was under the pontificate of St. Marcellus (308-310) that the last crushing blow was given to Paganism in Rome and in the West and he was the last Pope to give his life for the faith.

St. Celestine I (A. D. 425) writing to the Illyrican bishop says, "We have an especial care about all persons, on whom in the holy Apostle Peter, Christ laid the necessity of making all men our care, when He gave him the Keys."

The Apostolic authority is distinct from and superior to episcopal authority. Does that Apostolic authority continue, or does it not? If it does, where but in the bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, are we to look for it? (Brownson, Vol. VII, p. 475.) (Orestes A. Brownson, LL. D., eminent scholar, journalist and philosopher, whom Lord Brougham declared to be America's leading genius, is the author of several works on political, philosophical and religious subjects.)

There were two Councils held in Ephesus; one in 431, the other 449. Both were held in the same church, and yet the former is venerated by Christians, and the latter, called the Robber Council, is held in abhorrence. Why? Let us answer and say, because the council held in 449 was a council in which opposition was shown to the pope.

The Second Council of Nice in 787, that was the triumph of St. John Damascene's vindication of respect for sacred images, also declared its belief that "the See of Peter shines as holding the primacy over the whole world and stands as head of all the Churches of God."

In the case of Honorius he does not speak ex-cathedra. He addresses only one, Sergius; he defines nothing; and clearly advocates the cowardly policy of silence, as Dolan remarks. If Honorius wrote a treatise on theology dealing with the same subject and if it were condemned as erroneous, it would not affect his ex-cathedra pronouncements. He did not try to make his slothful impressions, official teachings.

Look at the important action of the Church even in its early days regarding jurisdiction. "The first general council (Nice, 325) had given to the See of Jerusalem a not clearly defined 'succession of honor,' meaning apparently, a place of honor next after the patriarchs,

because it is the holy city." * * "It was not till the 4th Council (Chalcedon in 451) that the Juvenal succeeded in getting this vague place of honor changed into a real independent patriarchate." ("The Greek Fathers," Fortiscue, p. 158.)

"It is to the Popes that Scotland owes her ancient and famous University, and both Oxford and Cambridge were founded not by kings and Parliaments, but by great Catholic prelates, with the sanction and blessing of the Holy See, who not only founded, but endowed them with royal munificence. And this is true, not only of England and Scotland, but, to some extent, of every country in Europe, for they all owe their ancient and famous Universities to the fostering care of the Popes, and of great Catholic prelates under the guidance and encouragement of the Popes." ("Ireland and Rome," Most Rev. Dr. Healy.)

In the famous epistle of St. Julius (337-352) to the Eusebian Bishops at Antioch (which Tillemont calls one of the finest monuments of ecclesiastical antiquity) he asks: "Why did they not write to us especially concerning the Church of Alexandria? Are you ignorant that it is the custom to write to us immediately, and that the decision ought to come from hence?" (Alban Butler, Lives of Saints, April 12.)

The Eusebians continuing obstinate led to the assembling of the Council of Sardica (347) which condemned them, sustained Julius and enacted right of appeal to Rome.

While the Papacy "Lasted."

Luther said to his squabbling brethren: "While the Papacy lasted, there was no such divisions or dissensions." Lutherans can see that the Papacy is very much in evidence to-day, Pius X condemning Modernism and inviting Christians to co-operate with him "to restore all things in Christ." And as while the Papacy "lasted" there were no such divisions as those which Luther regretted and which continue to rend and disgrace Christendom, why would not Lutherans avail themselves of the unifying influence of the Papacy? It is cruel irony that the ranks of the man who broke unity should now show such dissatisfaction and afford the greatest evidence of

not having the unity of truth and faith. For the last United States census tells us that Lutheranism is the most disrupted of the sects, numbering 24 denominations. Nay, the unchristian spirit of disunion is so great in Lutheran ranks that there are churches that will not associate with any other, the number of these independent Lutheran congregations being 83.

Replying to the letter sent in connection with the Second General Council, Damasus thus addresses the Bishops of the East: "Most honorable sons," says the Pontiff, "since your love renders to the Apostolic See the reverence which is its due, you show the same in no small measure to ourselves. For though in the holy church in which the holy apostle sat, and taught us how to handle the helm which has been committed to us, we nevertheless confess that we are unworthy of the honor. . . . Remain on steady ground, firm and unmoved in the faith, and henceforth allow neither your clergy nor laity to listen to foolish words and vain questions, for we have already given a form, that he who professes himself a Christian may keep it, etc. . . . May God keep you sound, most honored sons." (Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. V, 10.)

The Roman Council, which was convened by Pope Gelasius, in the year 494, says: "Though all the Catholic Churches throughout the world be but one bridal chamber of Christ, yet the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church has been preferred to the rest by no decrees of a council, but has obtained the Primacy by the voice in the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Himself saying: 'Thou art Peter, etc.' . . . First, therefore, is the Roman Church, the See of Peter, the Apostle, . . . But the Second See was consecrated at Alexandria in the name of the Blessed Apostle Peter, by Mark his disciple. . . And the Third See at Antioch is held in honor by the name of the same most blessed Apostle Peter, because he dwelt there before he came to Rome."

Formula of Hormisdas.

A document has come down to us from the early part of the 6th century. It antedates the 5th Ecumenical Council by 40 years, and is known as the "Formula of Pope Hormisdas." This formula was not prepared for

a Synod, though it was signed by both Greeks and Latins at the 8th Ecumenical Council, 869, as well as at those of Lyons 1274, and Florence 1439. It came into special prominence also at the Vatican Council.

When the Emperor Justin I and the Patriarch John of Constantinople, had grown utterly sick of the wretched schism, unrest, tumult and insurrection caused by the Monophysite heresy, they both wrote in 518 to Pope Hormisdas, begging him to receive them into his communion. Rome and Constantinople had been separated for 35 years. Hormisdas sent legates to Constantinople with the formula, then known as a "Libellus," and instructions, to demand as a condition for reunion with the Apostolic See, the signatures of the bishops of the East. The Emperor, John the patriarch and the chief bishops subject to Constantinople, signed without delay. In 519, all the Eastern bishops signed. I have chosen two excerpts from this famous document. "The first condition for salvation is to guard the rule of the true faith, and in no way to depart from the laws of the Fathers. And the saying of our Lord Jesus Christ: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, cannot be ignored; these words are proved by their effects, because in the Apostolic See, religion has always been preserved immaculate. . . . Following in all things the Apostolic See, and teaching all its laws, I hope that I may deserve to be in that one communion with you, which the Apostolic See maintains, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion." Thus a Pope in the early days of the sixth century. (The Papacy, Dolan, p. 181.)

"The Greeks," says Hefele, "for a long time made no further appeal to the 28th canon, and even omitted it from their collections, so that they, too, adduced only twenty-seven canons of Chalcedon." Dionysius Exiguus, Isidore, the Prisca, the Arabic collection of Josephus Aegyptius, and the Greek of John of Antioch—all as Hefele points out, have but twenty-seven canons of Chalcedon; because, as is well known, Pope Leo would not sanction the 28th canon.

The decree of Ephesus condemning Nestorius runs as follows: "The holy Synod declared: 'As in addition to other things, the impious Nestorius has not obeyed our

citation, and did not receive the holy bishops who were sent by us to him, we were compelled to examine his ungodly doctrines. We discovered that he had held and published impious doctrines in his letters and treatises, as well as in discourses which he delivered in this city, and which have been testified to. Unavoidably compelled by the canons, and by the letter of our most holy father and fellow minister Celestine, the Bishop of the Church of the Romans, we have come with many tears to this sorrowful sentence against him, that is, that our Lord Jesus Christ whom he has blasphemed, decrees by the holy Synod, that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal rank, and from all sacerdotal communion.'" (Hard. T. I, p. 1347.)

This sentence, one of the most solemn ever uttered in the Church, gives Bossuet occasion to note that the Fathers recognize, in the Pope's letter, the force of a juridical sentence, to which they felt bound to subscribe. (Darras Vol. 1, pp. 573, 574.)

How did Anglicans feel "bound" when Leo XIII condemned their Orders, and invited them back to Church Unity?

Did Sardica confer upon the Bishops of Rome prerogatives hitherto not possessed by them? No.

Were these prerogatives conferred by this Council on Pope Julius personal favors to the exclusion of his successors? No. (Vide, "The Papacy," Dolan, p. 13.)

"How then shall they call on Him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe Him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?

"And how shall they preach unless they be sent?" Rom. 10:14-15.

"He that believeth not, shall be condemned." Mark 16:16.

XIII.—DO THE FATHERS BEAR TESTIMONY TO THE PAPACY?

"I dispose to you, as My Father hath disposed to Me, a kingdom." Luke 22:29. Americans find no record of His handing over the kingdom to rebels.

"He that heareth you, heareth Me." Luke 10:16. Americans interestedly ask Englishmen why don't they hear those sent——those coming to them with clear, sure credentials, and saying "For Christ therefore, we are ambassadors. God as it were exhorting by us." 2 Cor. 5:20. They won't hear those certainly sent and thus hear God, but they hear those who run themselves. How then can they say with a certainty that they hear God? Perhaps they may be hearing doctrine so adulterated and wrongly interpreted, as not to be gospel at all.

"For our exhortation was not of error, nor of uncleanness, nor in deceit, but as we were approved of God that the gospel should be committed to us; even so we speak, not as pleasing men, but God, who proveth our hearts." 1 Thess. 2: 3-4.

It must never be forgotten that Christ who is Himself the door has given the key to Peter.

Protestants say that the Papacy has no authority in Scripture. Quote one Father teaching this.

Americans consider it extremely ludicrous to see non-Catholics quoting the Catholic Fathers against the Catholic Church in hopes of getting something favorable to their non-Catholicity.

If the Apostles were on equal footing then an Apostle would be greater authority than the successor of an Apostle. And yet we find the Corinthians appealing to St. Clement, Rome, rather than to St. John at Ephesus. In the same way to-day Anglicans should appeal to Rome rather than to Ephesus.

The past 400 years were years of learning and progress; and yet Americans see that England has not produced as many distinguished churchmen, as the preceding 400 years, although in ages called dark. And those who are eminent on history's page in the latter period are mostly those in touch with Catholicity.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans is a great doctrinal document. Yet side by side with this and the other Sacred Scriptures we find the Corinthians placing Clement's Epistle. Seventy years after it was received by the Corinthians we find it still read on Sundays at the gatherings of the faithful. (Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, H. E., iv, 23.)

Americans see that all seeking salvation must belong to the Gospel Church, and that England in 1492 regarded this Gospel Church, the Catholic Church. As the Catholic Church has not changed since, she is that same Gospel Church to-day. Nothing but invincible ignorance excuses from membership. Persons must enter the saving fold. It seems ironical that Englishmen claiming intelligence are only excusable through invincible ignorance. But can such a defence be truthfully and lawfully set up?

If unity in the faith be from Christ, diversity in the faith must be from Satan. Eh?

St. Augustin says: "I should not believe the Gospel itself, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to do so." Contra Epist. Fundam.

How wonderfully applicable are the words of St. Jerome to the infidelities in our day: "He that is not in the ark of Noah, that is, in the Church of Christ, shall be swept away by the coming deluge."

"To no one else but Peter did the Savior say: Thou art Rock and upon this rock will I build My Church. To Peter the Lord spoke, to one therefore that he might establish unity upon one." St. Pacian, Ep. 3, No. 11.

We find that St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, "according to ancient ecclesiastical custom" (as he said) brought the errors of Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, before Pope Celestine to whom Nestorius had already appealed (Alzog, Vol. 1, p. 595).

St. John Chrysostom: "Christ, speaking to the leader of the Apostles, says, Peter lovest thou Me? and upon his affirming that he did, He replies, If thou lovest Me, feed My sheep. . . . Why did Christ shed His blood? That He might obtain possession of those very sheep, which He entrusted to Peter, and to his successors (those after him)." (T. 1, I. 2, De Sacred. n. 1, p. 454.)

And again he says: "Peter, that leader (coryphaeus) of the choir, that mouth of the rest of the Apostles, that head of that brotherhood, that one set over the entire universe, that foundation of the Church, that ardent lover of Christ," etc (T. 6, In Illud, hoc scitote, n. 4, p. 334.)

St. Athanasius appealed to the Pope to rectify his grievances. And when St. John Chrysostom was driven by intrigue and violence from his See of Constantinople in the year 404, he appealed to Pope St. Innocent I, to annul and make void all that had been done against him, thus recognizing the Supreme Office of the Holy Father.

In this same century in the west we find the Pope's supremacy illustrated in the conflict between Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, and Pope Leo (A. D. 444). Owing to Hilary's refusal to acquiesce in the Pope's ruling, Leo deprived him of all ecclesiastical superintendence of his province, and under this deprivation he died in 449.

"Why persecutest thou Me" (Acts 9:4), was said long ago by our Divine Saviour, to Paul, persecuting the Christians in his day. If the Catholic Church is the lawful, historic, Apostolic successor of the Church that Paul persecuted, yea if it is the same Catholic and Apostolic Church, then to every bitter assailant, whether he attacks the Church in America, England, France, Italy or Palestine, can be asked, "Why persecutest thou Me." "He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of My eye" (Zach., 2:8).

Is unbelief a sin? Certainly. Well, reunion with the Gospel Church is the certain cure.

"We know that we are of God." 1 John, 5:19.

XIV.—DID ENGLAND ONCE BELIEVE THE PAPACY WAS SCRIPTURAL?

"Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that you be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1:10.

"But as then he, that was born according to the flesh, persecuted him that was after the spirit; so also it is now." (Gal., 4:29.) Yes, truly, for Americans see that the church born after the flesh—the Anglican Church, persecuted the Church that was born after the Spirit—the Catholic Church.

For England in schism let the prayer ascend: "O God, I beseech thee heal her." Num. 12:13.

Why attribute Transubstantiation to Trent? Did not Henry VIII consign people to the flames for not believing it as the faith of Old England?

Take Henry VIII and Cranmer as reformers, and take More and Fisher on the other side. Impartially, who stood the more in need of being reformed?

To be with the popes of the first four centuries of Christianity and not to be with the popes during the past four is indeed a strange inconsistency.

This primacy mentioned at Nice was not only of honor but also of jurisdiction; such as was exercised by Victor over the bishops of Asia; Leo at Chalcedon; and Gregory over the British bishops whom he committed to the care of Augustine.

As an illustration of the extent to which Parliament can carry on its irreligious mischief may be mentioned that in 1644 Parliament forbade the celebration of Christmas as a "Popish practice." The mischievous prohibition was corrected with the Restoration.

There was an authorized, constitutional, lawful Reformation effected at Trent. No one can truly call the agitation of the so-called reformers, who were calling each other hard names, as, nevertheless, an authorized, constitutional reformation. Honest, can they?

Preachers, nominally Christians, are reported in the Press as talking of the older faith, as compared with the newer faith—the 20th century faith. For Christians there ought to be only one faith—the faith once delivered to the saints. "The Eternal Gospel." (Apoc. 14:6.)

If the Anglican Church to-day claims continuity with the pre-Reformation Church, and if the pre-Reformation Church of England believed in the Papal Supremacy—that it was in conscious dependence upon the Holy See in spirituals from start to finish; that is from A. D. 597 to A. D. 1534, why does not the Anglican Church to-day believe in the Papal supremacy?

It was unscriptural enough to have the king—a mere layman—to be head of the Church in spirituals, but to have a female head of the Church capped the climax. And Americans see that Queens Elizabeth and Victoria figured as such heads. Although St. Paul said it is not permitted to women to speak in the Church, Anglicans gave women "all the say" and yet Englishmen copiously quote St. Paul!

English history tells how Henry II bared his back to be scourged by the monks for the martyrdom of Thomas à Becket (see Lingard under July 10, 1174); and the world would be saved of innumerable sins, misery, and bloodshed if his eighth kingly namesake had bared his unrighteous back to be disciplined by monks instead of hanging them at the front gate of their monastery.

The London Saturday Review says "the authorities of the Church of England have not yet made up their minds whether she is part of the Catholic and historic Christendom, or only one among a number of denominations."

After the Restoration under Mary the new religion was continued and enforced by Elizabeth, for as Hallam says, "Nor could the Protestant religion have easily been established by legal methods under Edward and Elizabeth without this previous destruction of the Monasteries." (Const. H. 1, 99.)

Sincere and Telling Words.

The candid words of Lord Halifax should be appreciated by his countrymen when he says that it is abnormal for Anglicans to be separated from the See of Peter their instructor through St. Gregory and St. Augustine, that there is every reason to believe the Divine intention was that there should be a center for the Catholic Church, and that Anglicans have a duty to ask themselves why the principle of authority has been largely ignored and why the article in the creed "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," has not been really held against them.

The Anglican Short says in his history, p. 16: "The Englishman who derives his blood from Saxon veins will be ungrateful if he be not ready to confess the debt which Christian Europe owes to Rome."

As Canon Hensley Henson, a non-Catholic writer, says, "The primary character of the Reformation was a national revolt against an international and supernational authority." Yes, as we have seen it was a revolution against a doctrinal institution—a teaching authority established by Christ, such as the *ecclesia docens* is.

Froude said that the Anglican Church was merely a branch lopped off from the parent stem. Others there are who say that at the Reformation the English Church merely washed her face. And for the benefit of those making this statement we quote Froude, merely adding that the poorest kind of face washing is to lop off the head.

What the Renowned Newman Says.

"So much must the Protestant grant," says Newman, "that, if such a system of doctrine as he would now introduce ever existed in early times, it has been clean swept away as if by a deluge, suddenly, silently, and without memorial; by a deluge coming in the night, and

utterly soaking, rotting, heaving up, and hurrying off every vestige of what it found in the Church.'' Development of Christianity.

''We know the kingdom is still on earth,'' says the same luminous writer. ''Where is it? If all that can be found of it is what can be discerned at Constantinople or Canterbury, I say, it has disappeared.'' Diff. of Anglicans.

''To be ever victorious is the prerogative of only one institution that has ever existed in the world, and this fact alone is enough to remove from any reasonable mind the possibility of doubting who its Author must be. Alas, that men are so inconsistent and forgetful that we have to argue with them to prove a fact that is as clear as the noon-day sun in the heavens.'' (Certainty in Religion, p. 66.)

''Fear Not, Ferryman.''

When the Catholic Church was crushed in England in the days of Elizabeth and her successors, still could the few English Catholic survivors have hope—hope in the promise of Christ. ''Fear not,'' was said to the ferryman alarmed at the storm, ''your boat carries Caesar.'' The ancestors of Charles Weld-Blundell, editor of the ''Englishman,'' London, and the few others left of the ancient Church could in their great anguish recall ''Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world;'' and behold we see that promise fulfilled to-day. No wonder English Catholics rejoice. The Church has revived and is further reviving in England. A new Catholic Cathedral stands beside old Westminster Abbey, and a re-established hierarchy flourishes. Millions of Catholics in England happily see that hope was not misplaced.

St. Columbanus, who learned to believe in papal authority in the monastic school of St. Columbkill, says: ''We are closely bound to the chair of Peter, for although Rome is great and renowned, through that chair alone is she looked on as great and illustrious amongst us.''

When Pope Clement XI closed his Pontificate, one of the longest, stormiest and most glorious in the history of the Church (Mar. 19, 1721), the Lutheran City of Nuremburg struck medals in his honor; and the Pasha of

Egypt, on hearing of his death, declared he could have wished the glory of the Koran such a chief as Clement XI. (Darras. Vol. IV, p. 438.)

It is true that in the Synodal Epistle of the Second General Council which was held at Constantinople, we find Jerusalem called the mother of all the Churches. That the Fathers wrote this simply from a chronological viewpoint is evidenced from the facts. (''The See of Peter,'' Dolan, p. 42.)

In his epistle to John Bishop of Syracuse, St. Gregory says, ''The Byzantine primate had been accused on some charge, and the most pious Emperor wished him to be judged by us, according to canonical ordinance. . . . As to his saying that he is subject to the Apostolic See; if any fault is found in bishops, I know not what bishop is not subject to it.'' .Greg. Ep. 59. ''No mediaeval Pope ever said more than this. Whatever Gregory's views were as to the title of 'universal bishop,' he certainly never favored any minimizing of the prerogatives of his See,'' laconically remarks Dolan (The See of Peter, p. 52.)

The sin of Constantinople is one of pride. At the 2d and 4th General Councils its friends wished it to be a Patriarchate because it was the new capital of the Roman world. This was a rather unworthy reason, and led to great trouble in the Church. The City on the Bosphorus has proved to be fertile in heresy and schism, but she has been humbled the past centuries beneath the heel of the unspeakable Turk. Compare her record with Christian Rome and what a wonderful contrast!

Had Pelagius power and authority to annul the Synod of Constantinople? Did the Orientals cry out or protest against Roman arrogance? Oh no. In face of their Constitution they dared not. And if Pelagius could annul that Synod, why could not his successor annul the Synods of Anglicans and Greeks?

We Appreciate What Is Sterling.

In Art. XX Anglicans refer to the Church. ''The Church hath authority in controversies of Faith.'' Now when there was a controversy in matters of faith why did not England acquiesce?

When the Church decided that Henry VIII was lawfully married why did not Englishmen abide by that decision? The Anglican Church is monumental evidence that England did not abide by that authority in the controversy. Americans detest dissimulation.

Then again, after the Marian restoration, when the Bishops drew up in 1559 the 5 Articles of Faith, as the declaration of the Church—the restored Catholic Church —why did the State smite its authority and settle its controversies in Faith?

Seeing the deceptive, traitorous, unmanly way the hierarchy acted in the days of Henry VIII when they preferred to save their own heads, and comply with the wishes of this apostate king, rather than to die for what was right with the noble Fisher, Americans admire the energy of the Catholic hierarchy of our day—Wiseman, Newman, Manning, Vaughan, Bourne, Hedley, etc., in their efforts to set their countrymen aright in faith.

Among the thousands of English martyrs are numbered Thomas More, Chancellor of England; John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester; Priors of their monasteries like Thomas Houghton; Abbots like Richard Whiting; Benedictine monks like Dom John Roberts; Jesuits like Campion, Southwell, Arrowsmith, and many more who died in the cause of truth; who gave up their noble lives rather than tell a lie. They believed it true, they knew it to be true, that which England believed for hundreds of years to be true—that Peter was the head of the Church by Christ's arrangement, and they honorably and heroically died in testimony of its truth.

Grosseteste of Lincoln had disputes with Rome regarding such matters as the presentation of foreign clergymen to benefices in his diocese, but he had no dispute with regard to doctrine. Of his obedience to the spiritual, but firm resistance to the undue exercise of the temporal power of Rome, Lingard says (under date A. D. 1250) that no man "ever professed a more profound veneration for the successors of St. Peter or entertained more exalted notions of their prerogatives. From his works it appears that he gave to their decretals the force of law in all Christian nations; that he maintained as the cause of God every immunity which they had conferred on the clergy; and that he inculcated with unusual vehemence the doctrine of the indirect superiority of the spiritual over the temporal power."

One of the great acts of Vandalism perpetrated by the deformation in England was the tearing down of the cross from steeple and shrine. Such reminds us of the words of St. Paul to the Philippians: "For many walk, of whom I have told you often (and now tell you weeping) that they are enemies of the cross of Christ?" (Phil. 3:18.)

It must not be considered unkind of us to quote the following verse which follows the above: "Whose end is destruction; whose God is their belly; and whose glory is in their shame; who mind earthly things." (3:19.)

"Which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Is. 33:14.

Where is the world-commissioned teacher for this 20th century?

XV.—LET US GET TOGETHER.

"For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace." 1 Cor. 14:33.

"One body, and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all." Eph. 4:4, 6.

"And I will gather together the remnants of My flock, out of all the lands into which I have cast them out; and I will make them return to their own fields, and they shall increase and be multiplied." Jer. 23:3.

"And I went up according to revelation, and conferred with them the gospel which I preach amongst the Gentiles, but apart with them who seemed to be something; lest perhaps I should run, or had run in vain." Gal. 2:2.

Why would not Anglicans follow the example of Paul and confer now with that authority that for the past 18 centuries "seemed to be something, lest they had run in vain?" And this authority—the Papacy—not only seemed to be something, but *proved to be something* in the conflict and turmoil of the past ages. And we can gloriously declare that Rome never surrendered the truth deposited with her. Rome! is it any wonder that the Christians of the world have reason to be proud of you? We refer to the ex-Cathedra pronouncements of the Bishop of Rome in substantiation of our statements.

"To co-operate with God in saving souls is to share in the most divine of all divine works."—St. Dionysius.

If the Church hath authority to decide in controversies of faith, evidently she is infallible.

"Rome has spoken, they are condemned. Why, I am condemned also." And this thought urged Newman to immediate action. So it should urge you also, dear reader.

"Therefore, whilst we have time, let us work good to all men, but especially to those who are of the household of the faith." (Gal. 6:10.)

Ballinger, one of the German reformers, wrote to Cranmer to dissuade King Henry from sending any delegate to the Council of Trent. Let no one in our day oppose Christian unity.

Preaching in Westminster Abbey, the Rev. Dr. Simpson recently said:

"We are perhaps the most undisciplined Church in Christendom. We have not been able to hold the spiritual movement of our nation together, nor blend in one the varieties of the Christian type. We have seen them part from us, one after another, to their loss and our own, erecting divisions outside our borders, rather than communities within; describing themselves as standing protests against our doctrine or our discipline; weakening the spiritual force of Christianity upon this Nation. And then we invite them to reunite with a Church conspicuous for its own divisions and clamorous with discordant gospels." "Londinium" in the Lamp. Vol. 8, No. 7.

That there were abuses in the days of the Reformation and that the Church was competent to correct them, let the Council of Trent itself bear witness. It is to be regretted for the cause of Chrisianity that the so-called reformers did not pursue the course that 15 centuries of ecclesiastical history had taught them, and have abuses corrected in a legitimate manner and by legitimate authority. Of course the Church did not want to uphold abuses. Let us hear what an eminent Protestant historian says: "It is usual," says Hallam, "for Protestant

writers to inveigh against the Tridentine Fathers. I do not assent to their decisions, which is not to the purpose; . . . but I must presume to say that . . . I find proofs of much ability, considering the embarrassments with which they had to struggle, and of an honest desire for reformation among a large body as to those matters which in their judgment ought to be reformed.'' And again:—''No General Council ever contained so many persons of eminent learning and ability as that of Trent; nor is there ground for believing that any other ever investigated the questions before it with so much patience, acuteness, temper and desire of truth.''

''For Christ, therefore, we are ambassadors, God as it were, exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God.'' (2 Cor. 5:20.)

In this Appeal for Christ's sake we ask the sects for unity and peace, so that they may become reconciled to God. Having become united, they ought become reunited with that authority in which is vested the ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:18). In this way only can they show their credentials as ambassadors for Christ to any pagan court. They must be sent from the Apostolic College, that received the unique and wonderful commission from the Master Himself. It is the office of him who presides over the Apostolic College—the Apostolic See, to supply these credentials stamped with what was given by the King in person—the Keys of the Kingdom—the emblem of authority.

It is utter vanity, yea, it is worse, it is utter depravity, to claim over the head of the Apostolic College—over the head of the Church, authority direct from Heaven, unless such a person receive an extraordinary mission or authority as Paul did, and unless he unmistakably prove it as Paul did. And even then he must become associated with the Apostolic College as Paul did, must be a member of it as Paul was, when he penned the above text. Yes, if he were formerly opposed to the Church, he must express his regrets with Paul, and must certainly become affiliated with that Church that holds, solely and singly, the diploma to the Nations for all time.

Americans see:

That Leo withstood the General Council of Chalcedon to defend the prerogatives of Peter's Chair.

That Brownson points out "without the Papacy the Church as Christ founded it would be inconceivable."

That the gift of infallibility is necessary to the Church, so as to preserve intact the deposit of faith revealed to man by Christ and His Apostles.

That according to the renowed Jerome, so familiar with the Scriptures, those who are not subject to the Papacy are of anti-Christ.

That a General Council derives its Apostolic authority from Christ through His vicar; and hence the necessity of the co-operation of the Pope.

That the renowned Newman told Anglicans we must either give up the belief in the Church as a Divine institution altogether, or we must recognize it at this day in that communion of which the Pope is the head. "Difficulty of Anglicans."

That unquestionably His Eminence, Cardinal Bourne, Westminster, is to-day teaching England what Gregory and Augustine taught.

That the English Apostle to Germany, St. Boniface, taught Appeal to Rome.

That in these days of Anglo-Saxon claims it is interesting to recall that no fewer than eight Anglo-Saxon kings made pilgrimages to Rome and paid their homage to the successor of the Fisherman.

The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, says Christ.

The gates of hell have prevailed against the Church, say Anglicans.

With all due respect to Anglicans, Americans prefer to believe Christ. Is not every good person with Americans in this respect?

In which non-Catholic Church is that clean oblation, that was to supersede the rejected Jewish sacrifices, offered up from the rising to the setting of the sun?

The Sectaries are mere book agents, circulating the Book with a false version and interpretation against the author.

The reformation has put back the conversion of the pagan for 400 years, how much longer will it retard his conversion?

At the Reformation, many matters of faith were abandoned, and the Gospel Church has been criticised ever since and abused for teaching them.

Human faith is based on human authority. Divine faith, such as Catholics profess, is founded on Divine authority. They believe what God has revealed because they believe that He knows, and believe Him to be truthful.

Nothing in the world needs reformation more than the so-called Reformation, which has landed the world in hundreds of divergencies from Christian unity!

Eliminating the 15th, 16th and 17th verses of the 21st chapter of St. John's Gospel, or denying the chief pastorate therein established is a different gospel, and must necessarily incur St. Paul's anathema.

In 1910 four American Presbyterian clergymen were ordained that denied the divinity of Christ and the Virgin birth. And these may be sent into Catholic countries to evangelize the benighted inhabitants. Just think of it!

What would you think of a teacher in a common grammar school that would profess to teach grammar and omit syntax? What would you think of a Sunday School teacher eliminating or omitting the chief pastorate—what Christ established to maintain Christian concord and government amongst men?

Just think of the folly of those placing the Bible in the hands of the pagan and expecting him to pick out the essentials, so that these essentials will be in unison with what is professed by the followers of Christ, characterized, as they are, by unity. Such a method to acquire Christianity on the book-agent's plan, and in spite of pagan natal prejudice, is absolutely impracticable. Do

we not see that the Bible agent, notwithstanding his Christian surrounding, has, himself, failed to fall into line of unity? But the Bible agent says he represents the church, and undertakes to explain it on behalf of the church—the Gospel Church—the authorized Church. This is false and deceptive according to his own system; for a protestant Bible agent is intended to be a substitute for the church rejected. As soon as the pagan finds out that he interprets in the name of the church he discards, he will chase the agent into the deep blue sea, and who can blame him?

"That you stand fast in one spirit, with one mind laboring together for the faith of the gospel." Phil. 1:27.

If the Popes be not the successors of Peter, well who is his successor?

Even now, as this Appeal is being penned, a Royal Commission is sitting to facilitate the abominations of divorce, His Grace, the Archbishop of York, being one of the Commissioners. And if the recommendations of the "Divorce Reform Law Commission" become an act of Parliament, it will be as obligatory on Anglicans and Englishmen generally as the Canons of the Four General Councils. Eh? Oh shades of Langton's Magna Charta!

XVI.—CHRISTIAN GOVERNMENT.

If God be for us, who is against us? Rom. 8:31.

O Lord thou art one God, let not man prevail against Thee. 11 Para. 14:11.

Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God. Rom. 13:1.

And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.

Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.

St. Matt. 18: 17-18.

Plainly there is no authority in Scripture to apostatize from the Gospel Church.

The Church has withdrawn the cup from the laity, say those who do not believe in the Real Presence at all.

If Christ did not come to establish a Church, and leave in it the treasures purchased by His Passion and Death, then what has He established, and what has He left to sinful man besides the Atonement?

The authority which Christ left on earth to govern people in matters of faith is the Church.

"Take heed to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God." Acts 20:28.

Dolan quoting from Soc. II, 17 says that Pope Julius I, only a few years after the Council of Nice, declared that no ecclesiastical decrees should be published, without Rome's consent, and that such was the law and the canon.

"It is but right," said Pope Innocent I (402) "that you should observe the ancient practice of consulting the Apostolic See, to which the care of all the Churches has been committed." (Alzog. Vol. 1, p. 671.)

Pope St. Leo I, called Leo the Great, who ascended the throne of the Fisherman in 440, asks God who willed to place him at the helm of His Church for grace sufficient for so great a work. (Serm. I.)

This same Pope Leo said in 461: "Though there be among the people of God many priests and many shepherds, yet Peter rules all by immediate commission whom Christ also rules by sovereign power."

We find this Pope writing the Bishop of Aquileia in whose diocese the Pelagian heresy had been spreading that those received back to the Church who were tainted with that heresy should announce by full and clear statements that they embrace and entirely approve all the conciliar decrees which the authority of the Holy See has ratified. (Ep. 1.)

These few selections from a mass of evidence are given to show the reader what was the teaching of the Church Universal regarding Church government in those days. This doctrine was brought to Anglo-Saxons by St. Augustine in 596. Why was it rejected in the reign of Henry VIII? Simply because the Pope wanted the king to keep the law of God, and the king wanted to break it. In connection with Church government how edifyingly do

we read of that truly noble king Charlemagne who earnently desired "to conform to the wish referred in the holy canons, that all important cases should be referred to the Apostolic See." (Darras, Vol. II, p. 416.)

For the benefit of those who place all their confidence in General Councils, we may remark that ere the Council of Nice was held, history tells of appeals made, decisions given, and heresies suppressed in that epoch intervening between Apostolic days and Nice. The government of the Church during the first 2 centuries and a half was not by General Councils. What then? (See Part II.)

But some one may say: "We have no need of a Church government, or of an authority to keep us right in spiritual affairs." What condition would England be in to-day if she had no temporal government? Horrible beyond description. In what condition are mortals, bereft of spiritual government? In confusion and ruin. In temporal matters we need authoritative direction and restraint exercised over the actions of men in communities, societies and states, so that they must observe the laws of men. So also we need in our midst that spiritual authority to keep order in the spiritual kingdom, an authority to tell us right and wrong in matters of faith, an authority to carry out the mandate of the Master. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." St. Matt. 28:18-20.

Anglicans must not forget that this question of Church government was adjudicated by Englishmen. For as Rev. L. J. O'Hern says in the Catholic World, Feb. 1909, that in 1382 a Doctrinal Commission, perhaps the largest and most representative ever held in the pre-Reformation Church, including amongst its members the Primate and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, condemned not merely as erroneous, or untheological, but specifically as heretical, the proposition that "after Urban VI (the reigning Pope) no one ought to be recognized as Pope, and we should live after the manner of the Greeks under our own laws." (Wilkins Concilia II, 157.)

That as other Governments are the best expounders of their principles, so also the Christian Government is the best exponent of her doctrines and power. Yea

better than all other Governments, for she alone is guaranteed against teaching error. And when Anglicans themselves admit that the Church is and must be infallible, being the voice of God to man, and that the voice is heard in General Councils united with the Pope, why are they not logical and consistent enough to accept whatsoever this voice announces? When therefore it announces that its head, the Pope, is infallible, why not accept it; and so on with other matters of faith and morals? Christians should listen with docility to the official pronouncements of the Christian Government. As Augustin of old said, "Roma locuta est, causa finita est."

Heresies Bear the Names of Their Founders.

To those who are fond of perusing the Bible we would say, "Who is a better scriptural authority amongst Biblical scholars than the great St. Jerome?" and he lays down the following:

"We must live and die in that Church, which, having been founded by the apostles, continues down to the present day. If, then, you should hear of any Christians not deriving their name from Christ, but from some other founder, as the Marcionites, the Valentinians, etc., be persuaded that they are not of Christ's society, but of Antichrist's." (Advers. Luciferan.)

"What new heresy," says St. Vincent of Lerins, in the sixth century, "ever sprouted up, without bearing the name of its founder, the date of its origin?" St. Justin, the philosopher and martyr, had previously made the same remark in the second century, with respect to the heretics of his time. (Advers. Tryphon.)

Whereupon, Milner concludes (Letter 25) by saying, "It is notorious that the different sects of Protestants, like the heretics and schismatics of old, are denominated either from their founders, as the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Socinians, etc., or from the countries in which they prevail, as the Church of England, the Kirk of Scotland, the Moravians, etc., or from some novelty in their belief or practice, as the Anabaptists, the Independents, the Quakers, etc. The first father of Protestants was so sensible that he and they were destitute of every claim to the title of Catholic, that in translating the Apostles' Creed into Dutch, he substituted the word Christian for that of Catholic. The first Lutherans did

the same thing in their catechism, for which they are reproached by the famous Fulke, who, to his own confusion, proves that the true Church of Christ (while of course being Christian) must be Catholic in name, as well as in substance. (On the New Testament, p. 378.)

Of Special Interest to Methodists.

The life of Rev. John Wesley, founder of the Methodists, which has been written by Dr. Whitehead, Dr. Croke and others of his disciples, shows, in the clearest light, the errors and contradictions to which even a sincere and religious mind is subject, that is destitute of the clue to revealed truth, the living authority of the Catholic Church, as also the impiety and immorality of Calvinism. At first, that is to say, in the year 1729, Wesley was a modern Church of England man, distinguished from other students at Oxford by nothing but a more strict and methodical form of life. Of course his doctrine then was the prevailing doctrine of that church; this he preached in England and carried with him to America, whither he sailed to convert the Indians. Returning, however, to England in 1738, he writes as follows: "For many years I have been tossed about by various winds of doctrine," the particulars of which, and of the different schemes of salvation, which he was inclined to trust in, he details. Falling, at last, however, into the hands of Peter Bohler and his Moravian brethren, who met in Fetterlane, he became a warm proselyte to their system, declaring at the same time, with respect to his past religion, that hitherto he had been a Papist without knowing it. We may judge of his ardor by his exclamation when Peter Bohler left England: "O, what a work hath God begun since his (Bohler's) coming to England; such a one as shall never come to an end till heaven and earth shall pass away." To cement his union with this society, and to instruct himself more fully in its mysteries, he made a journey to Hernhuth in Moravia, which is the chief seat of the United Brethren. It was whilst he was a Moravian, namely "on the 24th day of May, 1738, a quarter of an hour before nine in the evening," that John Wesley, by his own account, was "saved from the law of sin and death." This all important event happened at "a meeting house, in Aldergate street, while a person was reading Luther's Preface to the Galatians."

Nevertheless, though he had professed such deep obligations to the Moravians, he soon found out and declared that theirs was not the right way to heaven. In fact he found them, and "nine parts in ten of the Methodists" who adhered to them, "swallowed up in the dead sea of stillness, opposing the ordinances, namely, prayer, reading the Scripture, frequenting the sacrament and public worship, selling their Bibles, etc., in order to rely more fully 'on the blood of the Lamb.'" In short, Wesley abandoned the Moravian connection, and set up that which is properly his own religion, as it is detailed by Nightingale, in his "Portrait of Methodism." This happened in 1740, soon after which he broke off from his rival Whitfield; in fact they maintained quite opposite doctrines on several essential points. (For more of this experimental religion see Milner's End of Cont. p. 116, from which the above extract is taken). His followers may well doubt from the above variations and fluctuations whether he hit on right principles at last, or not. They cannot be infallibly sure they are right. There are no indications in the above guesses that he had authority from Heaven to start a new church. And while there is not a line in the New Testament to justify him to start a new church against the Church that started with the Gospel, nothing to justify him to oppose the Catholic Church existing since the days of the Apostles, we do find his policy reflected in the Sacred Writings. St. Paul (Eph. 4:13-14) speaks of meeting in "the unity of faith when persons will be no more tossed about with every wind of doctrine." Wesley found himself fluctuating because separated from the center of unity. And the followers of their fluctuating founder are distinguished since his day for their unscriptural attack on unity. Witness their tactics in Rome, the See of Peter, the center of Christian unity, to the utter disgust of Christendom.

Inconsistencies.

Englishmen consider they ought to have a national and independent church free from intrusion of a foreign bishop. Why, therefore, do Anglicans intrude their bishops into Catholic countries—Spain, Mexico, and the Philippines, etc.?

For 200 years after the Reformation a priest was a felon in England, liable to be hanged, drawn and quar-

tered simply because he was a priest; and now Protestants are irritated because the Pope has decided that Anglican ministers are not priests. ("Has the Reformation Reformed Anything?" p. 82.)

Anglicans to-day consider the Catholic Church all right, and pride themselves on being a branch of the Church. Then why not return to the unity of the Church and be part of her according to Catholic ideas and principles? (Id. p. 59.)

This publication from which we quote is published in England. But let us ask the author, "Who are Anglicans according to your idea?" "Followers of Christ united as one." "Oh, no," he probably would answer, and answer truly, "there are 5 or 6 factions within what is called the Church of England. They differ in many respects." But they are united in one grave sin—they reject the Papacy. They are opposed to God's grand plan for unity. We hate to print this, lest the pagans may read it, for Anglicans are followers—would-be followers, of the God of unity, and thus read about unity in the Sacred Scriptures.

Are You a Christian?

"I have always remarked one strange contradiction that exists in this world with regard to the science of religion. No man can pretend to be a doctor unless he has studied medicine—and studied it well, for otherwise he will have no patients; no man can pretend to be an architect or an engineer unless he has studied architecture and mathematics; no man can set up for a lawyer unless he has studied law—unless indeed he is content to be an advocate of lost causes. But in the face of this there are a great many who profess to be Christians who have never studied the science of the Christian which is religion. If I were to put the question to a great many outside this hall: 'Are you a Christian?' I would be answered immediately: 'By the grace of God I am;' but were I to ask again what a Christian is, many would be unable to tell me because they are in utter ignorance of the motives of our faith, the laws which govern our holy religion, and give no thought whatever to the concerns of faith and religion. And it is doubly strange to find that many who are in this state of ignorance are very willing to discourse as if they knew all about it, with the result that often they blaspheme what they know

not. Here in Rome itself, without going farther afield, there are many Christians, erudite enough on other matters, but totally ignorant concerning the teaching of religion—a culpable ignorance because it brings with it a neglect of all that pertains to the supernatural life and of what relates to the world to come.'' (Pius X.)

Americans see that England is in a state of apostacy from her belief in 1492. ''Thy own wickedness shall reprove thee, and thy apostacy shall rebuke thee. Know thou and see, that it is an evil and bitter thing for thee, to have left the Lord thy God.'' (Jer. 2:19.)

''But all things are of God, who hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.'' (2 Cor. 5:18.) The Church—the Roman Catholic Church—continues to hold the ministry of reconciliation. Why would not Englishmen and other Protestants become reconciled, healed first in schism, and regain the old full faith?

''Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven.'' (Matt. 16:19; John 20:20.)

Americans can find nowhere on the sacred page where those detached from, or opposed to, Peter got any power to bind or loose on earth; or got any power whatsoever in the kingdom.

''Amen, amen I say to you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me.'' (John 13:20.) England believed that it had already received Jesus in A. D. 1492, through the Catholic Church. Why cause a separation?

''What you bind on earth is bound in heaven.'' To what government on earth outside of the Catholic Church could these words be applied?

XVII.—THE ORIENT IS AWAKENING.

Declare His Glory among the Gentiles; His wonders among all people. (Ps. 95:3.)

The Gentiles shall walk in Thy light, and kings in the brightness of Thy rising. (Is. 60:3.)

By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God. (Eph. 2:8.)

The 26 Japanese martyrs of 1597 were canonized by Pope Pius IX.

In the days of Arianism the Chinese Emperors patronized it.

Orientals generally appreciate the poverty, self-denial, and asceticism of the Catholic missionaries.

Pagans have a horror for Christianity, which is represented to them as a 400-headed monster.

Where the Catholic Church is, there is Christ, and he that faithfully holds to the Church holds to Christ. This is truly godly.

Separated from the Catholic Church, persons cannot make an act of faith. They can make acts of guesses and opinions.

Methodism with credentials from the 18th century cannot be a witness to the existence of Christ. How Satan rejoices that Methodists assail the great Christian Center that has borne witness to Christ adown the ages!

Of course the Oriental ought to be Christian as well as the Occidental:

"For there is no distinction of the Jew and the Greek; for the same is Lord over all, rich unto all that call upon Him." (Rom. 10:12.)

15,000 Japanese Christians were found by the missionaries in 1865. It is a wonderful illustration of the tenacity with which the Japanese, converted and instructed, hold onto the faith, as during the period from 1630 to 1865 these had no priests.

How Chinese Generally Use the Bible.

Dr. Campbell Gibson tells of the Protestant missionary who lived in Hong Kong and sent native evangelists to distribute copies of the Bible among the people of the interior. The evangelists, however, stopped at home and sold their Bibles to the printer, who resold them to the missionary. So missionary and printer maintained between them a continuous circulation of the Bible!

Father Wolferstan in his "Catholic Church in China

from 1860 to 1907'' throws startling light on the use made by the Chinese of the Protestant Bibles so lavishly bestowed upon them. About ninety per cent. is lost, a large proportion being used for making the soles of Chinese boots and shoes. That the remaining ten per cent. do not always conduce to edification is made abundantly clear by Father Wolferstan in a series of well attested and very remarkable anecdotes.

Chinese are asking, ''What is Christianity, and which is the right kind?'' The right kind is that of the Apostles' and the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds. ''The one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.'' Even the State Church of England, although posing before the world as a Protestant church, makes this profession. This ought to be convincing to the Chinese. Why, therefore, does not the State Church unite with the Catholic to make this profession more emphatic and effective?

If Protestant missionaries insist on going to the Orient, they should proceed after the manner of John the Baptist, be forerunners for the Church of Christ. ''He that shall come after Me is mightier than I.'' The Church, His teacher, has the words of Eternal Life, having received them from the lips of the Master Himself.

Questions Asked by Orientals.

Four questions asked of Bible agents by Orientals:

Where did you get the Bible?

Who pronounced it inspired?

Why then do you discard the authority that gave you the Bible, especially when it tells you to listen to it?

Why do you quote to me that I should ''hear the Church,'' when you, yourselves, disregard it?

Father Wolferstan in his book ''The Catholic Church in China,'' asks why should we be interested in China and its three or four hundred million inhabitants? For many reasons. One is that astounding changes are taking place in that immense country, chan s to which Europe cannot shut her eyes. The whole future of the world will depend upon the extent to which Christian ideals are going to permeate China. And the task of Christianizing the Chinese can be accomplished only by the Catholic Church. To quote the words of a non-Catholic writer cited in this volume:

''Other hope failing, therefore, it seems to be after all to the Vatican and its disciplined agents that the

Christian world will have to look, if anywhere, for extrication from its dilemma in China." (London Catholic Times.)

Protestantism is the great obstacle to the spread of the Christian religion amongst the Orientals. Why? They are told that God the Son in pity assumed human nature to become our Redeemer; that this Redeemer taught His Apostles—deposited with them as a teaching society the truths He revealed; that He arranged that through their uninterrupted ministry these truths should be made known to the world; and that He guaranteed His co-operation to this teaching society till the end of the world. In opposition to this arrangement Protestantism undertakes to teach; but in order to be accredited it must first show that the basic principles of teaching authority above enumerated are discredited. And if discredited, what then?

A Modern Martyr.

On page 10, "Pages of Glory," containing narratives of thirty-four newly beatified martyrs of China, Cochin-China, and Tonquin we read thus of Blessed John Peter Neel:

The third of these martyred missionaries was naturally of a serious disposition, hard-working, persevering, but not particularly talented nor brilliant. He set out from Europe for Kuy-Tcheu in 1858, and was martyred in 1862. His apostolate was short and was swiftly rewarded by his arrest and execution.

Father Neel was apprehended by Chinese soldiers at the little village of Kia-cha-long, on the morning of February 18. Bound by the hair of his head to a horse's tail he was dragged to Kuy-Tcheu, an unimportant subprefecture, where he was briefly and brutally interrogated by the magistrate.

"What is your name?" demanded the mandarin.

"The Chinese call me Uen, my French name is Neel," replied the missionary.

"Kneel down."

"I am not a Chinaman. I have come from afar to preach the Christian religion here, as I am free to do, according to the treaty recently concluded between this country and my own land," was the calm response. "I will not kneel, for I am a visitor among you and not a criminal."

A soldier seizing a chain struck the missionary upon the shoulders, felling him to the ground. Father Neel raised himself upon his knees and attempted to show his passport.

"This passport was given you by your government, not by ours," answered the mandarin. "But no matter about that now, renounce your religion at once, or I will have you put to death."

"I will never renounce my religion. If that be the condition upon which you offer me my life, I reject it. You may put me to death as soon as you please," was the resolute reply.

A few minutes later, while the dusk of a winter evening was setting in, far in the interior of China, which the European armies hoped they had opened to religious liberty, Father John Peter Neel was beheaded.

* * *

Blessed John Peter, pray for your unhappy countrymen that are now assailing the faith for which you died! Pray, too, that Englishmen may accept the guidance of the successor of the Apostle Peter, so as to co-operate in bringing the unity of the faith into the so-called Celestial Empire.

Oh degenerate France of the 20th century! American Catholics—20 millions of American citizens, are ashamed of you. We expect to live to see your disgrace and infamy wiped out in tears and blood.

Neither Japanese nor Chinese will accept a diversified Christianity, or what appears to their untutored minds to be a Catholic God, and a Methodist God, and a Baptist God, and a Unitarian God, etc., while we at the same time proclaim there is only one God.

Nor will they accept human contradictions as the doctrine of Christ.

Nor can they understand how Christians, proclaiming that there is but one faith, yet establish churches distinguished from one another by difference in faith.

Nor can they accept doubtful Christianity, for if its Founder be divine, there must be some agency divinely assisted to deliver His doctrine accurately and in its entirety.

Nor can they easily recognize Christianity as Divine when diversity of faiths makes it appear that Christianity is made up of affirmations and denials of the same truth.

Nor can they fail to see that churches teaching contradictory doctrines are not all from God, as He did not teach contradictory doctrines.

"Behold, he that is unbelieving, his soul shall not be right in himself; but the just shall live in his faith." (Rom. 1:17. Gal. 3:11.)

Can any one of the 16th century sects say to Orientals that any one of their peculiar organization ever saw Christ?

Where are our dead? If I can help that one so loved in life I yearn to do so. If a dear friend has gone beyond and can help me, I want that aid. What does the Communion of Saints in the Apostles' Creed mean anyhow?

XVIII.—GET READY FOR UNITED ACTION.

"Some . . . have made shipwreck concerning the faith." (1 Tim. 1:19.)

"As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." (John 20:21.) It is well known that the Catholic clergy are sent. But God rebukes others, for He did not send them, yet they ran.

Englishmen do as St. Paul commanded the Corinthians: "Try your ownselves if you be in the faith; prove ye yourselves." (2 Cor. 13:5.)

Are you in the Catholic and Apostolic faith such as you profess in Art. VIII? Perhaps you are in the Protestant faith. And what is that? Quote Scripture and Councils of the Church.

"Going therefore teach ye all nations," evidently meant true faith, true doctrine. Those not having true doctrine are not sent. Who sends them? Why should they teach error?

Those, who would fain have Apostolic Succession, ought to get the abominable Homily corrected, which stated that for 800 years the whole of Christendom was drowned in abominable idolatry, for what advantage would it be to have a continuity with idolatry?

Americans are horrified in reading that the English Reformation was ushered in by murder and robbery. Looting monasteries, destroying churches, and butchering men for being good, truthful and honorable was a mighty poor way to establish a Reformation. Americans cannot but feel surprised at Englishmen remaining under the spell of such a Reformation as that.

Christ insists on our believing His message—the truths He has revealed. He that assumed human nature so as to teach us in a man-like manner, and loved us so much as to die for us, tells us quite plainly He will damn us unless we believe what He has taught. Has he taught that He is really present in the Eucharist? If so it is manifest that denial of it involves damnation.

Rev. John Wesley visited America to convert the Indians. Returning to England in 1738, he declared he was unsettled in his religious convictions, and that hitherto he had been a Papist without knowing it. Had he succeeded, and unwittingly made them Catholic, would it not be sad to witness Methodists to-day acting so inconsistently and un-Christianlike as to try to deprive the descendants of those Indians of that religion?

Strange that people cannot see that the "Bishops' Act of Homage," which every Anglican bishop has to take upon his knees, testifying that all religious as well as temporal authority is vested in the sovereign, entirely cuts off any connection with the fallacious theory held by some Ritualists that there is a continuity of doctrine as between the Catholic Church in England in 1492 and the Ecclesia Elizabethana of our day.

Calvin says: "God requires nothing of us but faith; He asks nothing of us but that we believe." (Calv. in Joan 6.) While he was making such false doctrine and throwing the Ten Commandments overboard, and insisting thus strongly and solely on faith, Americans see that he himself stood condemned for want of faith, since he rejected several articles of faith believed by his ancestors, and taught by the Universal Church.

Rejecting Rome, Rejects Rome's Honors.

Americans consider that when England rejected Rome, she rejected Roman authority in England, or the Primacy set up at Canterbury by Roman authority. It would be interesting to know precisely what those clerics that penned the 39th Art. meant by "Church" mentioned therein. Probably the Church Universal or Catholic, although now England found herself severed from the Greek and Roman Churches. It was a piteous sight to see a few clerics, devoid of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in insular quarters, incoherently talk about the Church of the Universe.

When non-Catholics talk or write about the Papacy, they should know what the Church does hold or teach on the subject, so that they may not be talking about an imaginary subject, or repeating nursery tales. Let them study what the Church does teach for example on infallibility, so as to speak intelligently on the subject. Let us say right here for their instruction that if a Pope wrote a treatise on philosophy or theology, and if it were condemned as erroneous by succeeding Pope or Council, that would not affect the Church's teaching as to his ex-cathedra or official pronouncements. And as it is only when the Pope speaks as Chief Pastor, as Universal Teacher, to the whole world on a matter of faith or morals that we regard him as infallible; evidently such questions as Gallileo's condemnation, and the action of Vigilius and Honorius, find no place here.

Of Cranmer, Dr. Littledale has written: "Every crime which tempted him he committed, every crime which anyone in power wished to commit, he assisted or condoned." Americans do not see here any indications of Cranmer being a heavenly reformer. And the abolishing of the Mass may be attributed to him. Abolishing the Mass and the Sacrament of Penance were diabolical deeds. In line with this diabolism was the overturning in England of the Papal authority that upheld the doctrine and the dispensing of these Sacred Mysteries. Americans appeal to every good Englishman to do his best now to undo the wrongs of an evil past.

If the Mass is Christ's own ordinance, as the Church Universal repeatedly declared it to be, then abolishing it by ungrateful, unworthy men, must be very wicked. Don't you think so, reader?

Hearken to one that is "English of the English."

Let there be a supreme effort to unite English-speaking people in the one faith, as well for their own good, as for the benefit of the world.

Let England, that has been for the past four centuries extending her empire to the four quarters of the earth, re-adopt as her national religion what our Savior intended to be the world religion—the true faith. For as her patriotic prelate Rt. Rev. Dr. J. Vaughan reminds his countrymen, "One God is the Father of all nations, so His one Church is the Church of every nation and suits every race—yes, even the Saxon and the English."

Let Englishmen cease belittling themselves in matters of faith. "Protestants," says the same Dr. Vaughan, "talk and argue and chatter away as though there was something in an Englishman's character which is incapable of assimilating the doctrines and practices and principles of the Catholic Church, quite forgetting, in their heated harangues and impassioned eloquence, that England was Catholic to the core for by far the greater part of its history—yes for over 1000 years, and that no Englishman was anything but Catholic during the four-fifths of her civilized life. . . . We have to appeal to an Englishman's susceptibilities. We have to show him that after all, there is nothing trivial, or fanatic, or un-English, in the Catholic faith. That it not only suits him and his character, and his spirit and disposition, but that as a matter of fact it was as Catholic and Roman and Papal that England first rose into prominence and became a nation, and laid the foundation of her constitution and government.

"Her greatest universities were opened; her noblest cathedrals were built, and her greatest battles were won, while she was essentially and unmistakably Catholic. But this, the present Church of England, though not yet four hundred years old, is anxious that we should forget. Anglican bishops and parsons are openly and unblushingly declaring that there never was a Roman Catholic Church in this land."

We, of the land of George Washington, are simply astounded that Englishmen would make themselves so supremely ridiculous as to deny these historical facts as pointed out by this illustrious bishop in their midst today. That the practice of the Catholic religion is not

un-English, but that "it suits the Englishman and his character, and his spirit and disposition," is evidenced by its unswerving and heroic practice by the Vaughan family. For who more conservative and English than the Vaughans?

Americans see:

That if we go back 1000 years from A. D. 1492 to interpret antiquity, we will need a sure interpreter of it.

That if we have to go back to the dim past—to the 5th century, for a teacher—for a sure guide, whose services terminated there, there is no guide for America. But Americans believe that the teaching Church—the Church that was to teach "all nations," and which the Savior was to be with "all days," still exists to teach them.

That a real Christian—a member of the Gospel Church—a Catholic—a true believer during the period of the Four Councils (as since) was a person in communion with the Bishops, and not with the Bishops merely, but with those Bishops who had the Pope at their head. This was the test of genuine Christianity adown the ages—communion with Rome.

That if we go back, Catholics are strengthened to find that what the Church of the first four centuries—the Primitive Church, professed, they profess; but what it condemned the sects profess! Thus Unitarians profess as the Arians. Repudiators of the Blessed Virgin profess with the Nestorians.

That those denying the Church the power to absolve penitent sinners, and make their appeal to reason, will find themselves at home with the Novatians who flourished about the middle of the third century, whose founder is described by St. Cyprian as "a deserter from the Church, a teacher of pride, and a corrupter of the truth."

That those refusing to pray for the dead, as also those rebelling against episcopal jurisdiction, can find their theories upheld by the Aerians in the middle of the fourth century; while those indulging in smart anti-Popery pamphlets can use the literature of the heretic Vigilantius, who was flagellated by St. Jerome.

That those in schism can refer to the Donatists of the fourth century.

We can thus see what Newman means by saying "to be deep in history is to cease to be a Protestant."

Important Facts in Early History.

In his erudite treatise, "The See of Peter," showing Ante-Nicene Papal authority, Father Dolan clearly establishes that Clement of Rome, during the lifetime of John the Evangelist, hearkens to an appeal from Corinth and issues an unmistakably authoritative document which quieted the disturbance then existing in the Corinthian Church. The letter was read in Corinth and elsewhere at public services for several centuries.

2. Ignatius of Antioch declares that the Roman Church rules over the Church "coetus caritatis," and holds the dignity of the first place.

3. Irenaeus calls the Church of Rome—the greatest, with which all others must agree by reason of its great power.

4. "From Rome," says Tertullian, "comes to us the very authority of the Apostles themselves." "Pontifex maximus, episcopus episcoporum" (sovereign pontiff, bishop of bishops) are titles with which he designates the incumbent of the Roman See.

5. Cyprian identifies Rome with the Catholic Church "He is in communion with Cornelius, that is with the Catholic Church." He maintains that the unity of the priesthood has its source in the Roman Church, and that "perfidia" can have no access to the Romans. He begs Rome to excommunicate a bishop.

6. Victor of Rome excommunicates the churches of Asia.

7. TheMontanists from Phrygia take their cause to Rome.

8. Dionysius of Rome calls Dionysius of Alexandria to account for his teaching, and the Alexandrian bishop both submits and explains.

9. Stephen utterly refuses to treat with the emissaries of Cyprian, and annuls the main proceeding of the Carthaginian Council. Pp. 76, 77.

Voices from the Days of Faith.

The learned Abbot Dom Gasquet says in his book, "On the Eve of the Reformation," "We, naturally turn to the works of Sir Thomas More for evidence of the teaching as to the Pope's position at this

period; and his testimony is both abundant and definite. Thus in the second book of his "Dyalogue," written in 1528, arguing that there must be unity in the Church of Christ, he points out that the effect of Lutheranism has been to breed diversity of faith and practice. "Though they began so late," he writes, "yet there are not only as many sects almost as men, but also the masters themselves change their minds and opinions every day. Bohemia is also in the same case: one faith in the town another in the field; one in Prague, another in the next town; and yet in Prague itself, one faith in one street, another in the next. And yet all these acknowledge that they cannot have the sacraments administered, but by such priests as are made by the authority derived and conveyed from the Pope, who is, under Christ, Vicar and Head of our Church." (Eng. Works, p. 171.)

"The Church began with Christ, and has had Him for its head, and St. Peter His Vicar after Him, and the head under Him; and always since the successors of him continuously." (Eng. Works, p. 185.)

We find the following extract in a sermon preached at a Synod of Archbishops and Bishops held in Westminster in 1527. The discourse is directed against the errors of Luther, and incidentally touches upon the affliction brought upon the Pope by Luther's rebellion. Bishop Longland is the preacher. "Shall we not mourn," he cries, "for the evil life of the chief Church (of Christendom)? Shall we not beseech God for the liberation of the primate and chief ruler of the Church? Let us pray then; let us pray that through our prayers we may be heard. Let us implore freedom for our mother, the Catholic Church, and the liberty, so necessary for the Christian religion, of our chief Father on earth—the Pope." (Joannis Longlondi Tres Conciones (R. Pynson). f. 45.)

When Dr. John Clark, the English ambassador in Rome, presented to Leo X in open consistory the famous "Assertio Septem Sacramentorum" of Henry VIII, he said, "that in the mind of his sovereign the attack on the Pope by Luther was an attack upon a divinely established order." He protested in the name of Henry, "the devotion and veneration of the king toward the Pope and his most Holy See." "Luther had declared war," said the minister, "not only against your Holiness, but also against your office, . . . and

against that Rock, established by God Himself." "England," continued the speaker, "has never been behind other nations, in the worship of God and the Christian faith and in obedience to the Roman Church." (Assertion of the 7 Sac. against Luther.)

The Church is the exponent and champion of religion.

"The British Encyclopedia just published," says the Michigan Catholic, "credits Ireland with being the most moral country in the world." Yes, and it might be added "and the most devotedly Catholic."

If the Apostles found it necessary to draw up a Symbol or Creed or form of Christian faith "that all may speak and think the same thing," why is it not proper that Christians would lay aside their various and unauthorized Creeds in this 20th century, and have one—an authorized one in common?

Everybody who knows anything about the religions of the world knows that the Catholic Church started from and by Jesus Christ. Everybody that knows history knows that the Anglican Church started because Henry wanted to put away his lawful wife Catherine. "What therefore God hath joined together, let not men put asunder." So said our Divine Savior as recorded by St. Mark, 10:9. When a person realizes why he is an Anglican how puzzled must he be!

A movement has been started by the Episcopalians of Cincinnati to unite all denominations of Christians in one universal church, and one wealthy New Yorker has subscribed $100,000 to further the enterprise. They might as well try to unite the sands on the seashore. There is a Universal Church which they all can and should enter, and in it not only union but unity is realized.—"Western Watchman." It remains to be seen how much interest will be taken in this Appeal for this very purpose.

In that mighty concourse of representatives of the nations at the Eucharistic Congress in Montreal when the five great races of humanity were represented, there

was no visitor, outside of the Papal Delegate, that attracted more attention by his sincere utterances than Rev. Bernard Vaughan, S. J. His words had a right good, sterling ring to them.

Prior to sailing for London, Father Vaughan said:

"The Protestant ministers fling down a challenge to me and ask 'Where is the nation the Catholicity has built up commercially?' But I refuse their challenge. That is not the question before us. I know that Christ did not found His Church to be a chamber of commerce. Let me fling a challenge to the ministers: Show me a nation that Protestantism has built up spiritually. Where has Protestantism developed reverence for authority; kept down or denounced divorce or hurled its anathemas against race suicide? Show me a Protestant nation that is ready to die to give a Christian education to its children. When the Presbyterian ministers show me that Protestantism in the United States is a vital and vitalizing power in combating the evils I have referred to I'll take back all I said. They can't do it."

Will any kind of an old Gospel do to have preached? People would be justly offended at such a question. "We want nothing but the truth as it is in the Lord Jesus." This is correct. Now how are you to get that truth, and be absolutely certain it is the truth?

"O magnify the Lord with me; and let us extol his name together." (Ps. 33:4.)

"Who is the Lord that I should hear His voice? I know not the Lord." (Exod. 5:2.) Well, the Lord says to us: He that heareth the Church heareth Himself.

If Christ wonderfully delegated power to man to forgive sin as He clearly did ("Whose sins ye shall forgive they are forgiven them"), and if this power is not retracted nor curtailed—not amended nor suspended—if that power remains in the Church to-day in full force and efficacy, for the benefit of sin-laden mortals, how utterly foolish are they not to receive the benefit?

If the sovereigns of England since the days of Henry's daughter Queen Elizabeth were "Defenders of the Faith" why did they not defend the Chief Pastorate of Peter which ancient Councils and Convocations held as a matter of faith, and which they declared was enjoyed by the Bishop of Rome?

XIX.—TIME FOR THE ENGLISH SCHISM TO BE HEALED.

"Be thou faithful until death, and I will give thee the Crown of Life." Apoc. 2:10.

"Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life." James 1:12.

To those of the faith who have read this Appeal we say: "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy Crown." (Apoc. 3:11.) And to those not of the household of the faith we entreat them to consider the Appeal most friendly; for it is addressed to them "for the sake of truth, which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us forever." (2 John 1:2.)

Early in this progressive, enlightened 20th century let it be proclaimed, "It is time for the warring forces of Christianity to become reconciled."

That light placed on the rock—the Church of the Living God—must be a cheery sight to mariners buffeted on every side with the waves of heresy.

Persons should never forget that in the relentless persecution of the Church adown the ages, no dogmatic declaration—no declaration in matters of faith, of one Council was contradicted by another.

Nice declared that Rome always had the Primacy. Yes, not only of honor but of jurisdiction. The Council of Arles, held in 314, ten years before Nice, may be regarded as voicing the general sentiment of the ante-Nicene Church, and it voiced the supremacy.

William the Conqueror attended Mass every day, we are told by Lingard.

It was an English Catholic sailor that saved England from Spain by destroying Spain's "Invincible Armada."

"The first King George—George of Hanover, was a German Lutheran who was placed on the English throne to the prejudice of more than fifty princes who had better claims to the throne, but who were debarred because they professed the faith of old England." (Darras Vol. IV, p. 429.)

"William the Conqueror applied to the Pope to remedy, if possible, the evils which afflicted the English Church resulting from the protracted struggles between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes. Alexander II (1061-1073) sent three legates to England, who held Councils at Winchester and Windsor and deposed several unworthy bishops, including Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury. With the reforms inaugurated by these legates and the accession of Lanfranc to the primatial see of Canterbury began a bright and prosperous era for the English Church." (History of the Church, Spaulding, p. 400.)

Miscellaneous.

The newspapers report a falling off in the membership of the sects in England as per reports for 1910.

A wonderful event in our day is the conversion of the son of the late Primate of Canterbury to the faith of that Church that made the city distinguished. Father Benson returning to the ancient faith, ought to have a wonderfully good effect on his countrymen.

It has come to this—that Christians are losing their faith and two-thirds of the world continue pagans, and Christians may largely blame themselves. For by our quarrels and dissentions we have proved to the world that we are unworthy of the one faith.

If 200 delegates tomorrow were to assemble at the Japanese Court, and present credentials, setting forth the name of their organization, its date of foundation, name of founder, and name and address of the delegation from such organization, the question might first be raised, "Was there ever such a being as Christ?" Evidently those founded since the 16th century can't be witnesses to Christ. It is only the Catholic Church that can say: "I saw Him, heard Him, and received what I profess from His Divine lips."

There have been corrective movements (or reformations if you will) within the Church. Witness the cor-

rective measures and rigorous reforms of Gregory VII and the legislation of the Council of Trent. But between Catholic and Protestant reformations there is a vast and vital difference. They are effected on different principles. Catholic reformers have fallen back on their model —Christ, and on the power of the Holy Spirit to renew those souls whom He has regenerated in Baptism. Protestant reformers begin by separation from the Church —the mystic body of Christ, severing themselves from the principle of life, and cutting themselves off from the life-giving channels of grace, called Sacraments.

Let it be Emphasized.

We have taken much care to plainly lay before the English people that they have apostatised, or left "the faith once delivered to the saints." We earnestly ask for return to that same saving faith, else dreadful retribution awaits them inevitably. Let each one listen to the words of the great Apostle to the Gentiles : "Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance? But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasureth up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and revelation of the just judgment of God." (Rom. 2:4, 5.)

Either England return to the faith once delivered to the saints, or those live to-day who may witness her day of wrath and revelation of the just judgment of God, for she has debauched the nations.

What Americans wish to impress on the Christians of the world is this: Those who were rebel church leaders in the 16th century, those who were foremost in leading people away from the already existing Church, which people at that time regarded as the Gospel Church, were men not specially sent by God to reform the Church— were men not claiming themselves as sent for this purpose, were men who could not prove that they were sent for this purpose; and if they were not sent, did not claim they were sent, and could not prove that they were sent, why should the world regard them as being sent by God, or take any stock in their teaching and organization contrary to this Gospel Church?

The Christian communities throughout the world with the sole exception of Protestants proclaim their belief in Christ really present in the Eucharist. Thus the Nestorians and Eutychians, who departed from the Catholic

Church in the 5th century, admit the Real Presence in the Sacrament. Such also is the faith of the Greeks who seceded from us 1000 years ago. Such also is the faith of the Russian Church. So also is it the faith of Schismatic Copts, the Syrians, Chaldeans, Armenians and all other Oriental sects no longer in communion with the See of Peter. It is therefore, says Father Zollner, an incontrovertible truth that the doctrine and belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament has always been in the Church. The doctrine is thus expressed by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (4th Century): "He, Himself, having declared, this is My Body, who shall dare to doubt henceforward? And He having said, this is My Blood, who shall ever doubt, saying: 'This is not His Blood.'" Protestantism is negativism, against the positive teaching of Christ's Church.

Facts from Fourth General Council.

From the brief survey of the history of the Council of Chalcedon, in its relation to the Papacy, the following propositions appear quite beyond the pale of reasonable question:

1. The Council was summoned at the request, and with the concurrence of the Pope.
2. The presidency of the Synod was in the hands of the Pope's legates.
3. This presidency was boldly insisted upon during the conciliar sessions.
4. The Synod subscribed the "Tome" of Leo as a dogmatic definition.
5. The Synod declared unequivocally that Leo was head of the Council and head of the Church; it addressed him as "Father" and entreated his approval and ratification of the Council's enactments.
6. Leo's legates repudiated the 28th canon, and Leo himself declared that by the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter he solemnly annulled it.
7. Rome never approved it.

(The Papacy, Dolan, p. 109.)

Napoleon's Dying Testimony.

Persons acquainted with English history know that this time 100 years ago and later that Napoleon Bonaparte cut quite a figure in history. The greatest men in England fought him by land and sea

Yet he declared in his exile in St. Helena that the happiest day in his life was not when he conquered the Austrians on the plains of Marengo, nor in any great historic event that is indelibly connected with his memory, but the day of his first holy Communion was the happiest, grandest day of his life. When he came to die his last will and testament begins with the words: "I die in the bosom of the holy Roman Catholic Church."

Non-Catholic Testimony.

"It is impossible," says the Anglican Milman, "to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the Middle Ages without the mediaeval Papacy."

"Historically the Church of the (Petrine) Chair was the root and mother of the one Catholic Church." Professor Harnack.

"Christ," says Bishop Pearson, "never appointed two roads to heaven, nor did He build a Church to save some, and another for other men's salvation. As none, then, were saved in the Deluge, but those who were within the ark of Noah, so none shall ever escape the eternal wrath of God, who belong not to the Church of God."—Exposition of the Creed.

"Whosoever reads their writings will find those of the fourth and fifth ages giving the supremacy to the Bishop of Rome, and asserting that to him belongs the care of all Churches."—Dumoulin, Vocation of Pastors.

"Chillingworth, decidedly the ablest champion the Protestant cause has ever counted, confesses that divine faith is not possible on Protestant principles." (Brownson, Vol. 5, p. 513.)

"Rome, being a Church consecrated by the residence of St. Peter, whom antiquity acknowledged as the Head of the Apostolic Church, might easily have been considered, by the Council of Chalcedon, as the Head of the Church."—Blondel on the Supremacy.

Salmon who can hardly be suspected of advocacy of the Papacy, yet declares: "He (Clement) as Bishop of that Church which was founded by the Apostles, speaks authoritatively, and thus shows the first beginnings of pontifical authority." (Intro. to Study of N. T., p. 646.)

Melancthon, and other high authorities of the Reformation, acknowledged the antiquity and importance of the Supremacy of the Roman See. Thus Melancthon

says: "There is no dispute on the superiority of the Pope, and the authority of bishops; the Pope, as well as they, may keep this authority." Again, "The monarchy of the Pope would also contribute much to preserve the unity of doctrine among different nations; if other points could be settled, we should soon agree respecting the supremacy of the Pope." This opinion of Melancthon is thus referred to by the illustrious Grotius, who was himself a strong advocate for the Primacy of the Roman See, as the only means of preserving unity in the general Church of Christ. With Grotius, too, may be associated, as another authority in favor of the Primacy of Rome, the no less illustrious name of the philosopher Leibnitz. See his Systema Theologicum. In a yet more recent Protestant writer than any here referred to, the Baron Senkenberg, Professor of Law in the Universities of Gottingen and Giesen, and Aulic Counsellor, etc., under the Emperor Francis I, we find the following strong opinion on the same subject: "It is right that there should be a system of government among Christians, and it is right that there should be a head to preside over it; and none else can be more qualified for this office than the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the representative of the Blessed Peter through an uninterrupted succession." Method Jurisprud. 4, de libertate Ecclesiae German. ("Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Quest of a Religion," p. 136.)

Yearning for the Mother Church.

The American Catholic, a "high" church Episcopal organ published in Los Angeles, says: "Destined, as we are, to contend for principles which seem to us of divine ordering, and so to be brought into open controversy with the Roman Church, we nevertheless do not hesitate to aver our yearnings for closer union with her; and our admiration of her saints, living and dead. We should know ourselves strangers to honor, false to ourselves, did we try to conceal these feelings under the mistaken notion that loyalty to our religion compelled us to see good only in ourselves. Nor can we contemplate the effects of that wonderful sacramental system, visible in the patient devotion to our Lord, so apparent among the priests and people of the Latin Church, without devout thanksgiving for its preservation through the ages, intact, unwavering."—The Catholic Telegraph.

"Which?"

What does the Englishman of to-day say? Which was right——King Henry who violated the marriage tie, or Pope Clement who upheld the sanctity of marriage? Which figures noblest in history—More and Fisher, the defenders of the old religion, or Cranmer and Cromwell, the sponsors of the new?

Which is better—a Church of seven Sacraments, or one with only two?

Which is safer—a Church in which the Bible and the Creeds of Christendom declare there is salvation, or one in which there is no salvation? A Church from the days of the Apostles, or one of yesterday?

Let us see the Mass of Edward, the Confessor, restored under Edward VII's son, King George V.

Wycliffe was seized with his fatal illness while attending Mass. (Lingard under date 13th July, 1382.)

Don't forget that Westminster Hall, the pride of Englishmen, was built in honor of the Mass.

We find the Papacy as a reformer, an effective, legitimate, constitutional reformer of the abuses and corruptions of the age, in the person of the great Hildebrand—Gregory VII (1073-1085).

Americans see that there is one unanswerable argument for the historic evidence of Christ, and that is Christianity itself. If He who is called Jesus Christ did not establish it, then who did?

Americans see that the Church with headquarters in Rome has existed since the foundation of Christianity, and has never separated herself from any other Church claiming Apostolic origin.

Granted that England, in 1492, regarded the Catholic Church, as the Gospel Church. We find this Church at Trent (1545-63) enacting "If any one denies, that in the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus

Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but says that He is therein as a sign, or in figure, or by His virtue, let him be anathema." (Sess. 13, Can. 1.) If these premises are true, as they are, then the consequences to unbelievers are direful.

Talk about Transubstantiation being invented at Trent indeed! The Council of Trent was held in the 16th century, and in the very city where the Last Supper took place we find St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the 4th century writing: "What seems to be bread is not bread, but the Body of Christ; and what seems to be wine is not wine, but the Blood of Christ."

Americans were often told that the doctrine of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation was invented at the Council of Trent held from 1545 to 1563. But Berengarius of Tours in the 11th century, denying Transubstantiation and the Real Presence, elicited a beautiful dogmatical letter from Hugh of Langres in 1049. Several Councils condemned Berengarius. He solemnly retracted his errors three times, the last being in the presence of William the Conqueror. Berengarius never replied to the severe criticism of Lanfranc. Never was any heresy more universally condemned over the whole Church. (Alban Butler, Lives of the Saints, under date April 19.)

Americans recognize a peculiar fitness in the selection of Rome to be headquarters of the forces that were to diffuse the Christian religion throughout the world—that the capital of the Pagan world was selected to be the capital of the Christian world—that the capital of the civilized world was selected to be the capital of the Christianized world.

And since we recognize the peculiar fitness of the selection, let us challenge the world to show that Christian Rome has not honorably acquitted herself in the face of all obstacles. Has she not proved to be a veritable citadel—a wonderful center of Christianity despite her foes? If any heresy whose object would be to effectually destroy Christianity should have arisen in the past 19 centuries one would think that Rome should be sought by the plotters as suitable. But taking the entire scope of 19 centuries, what heresy, effectual or ineffectual in

its fatal tendencies to ruin creatures in their relation to the Creator, has found congenial soil in Rome? What heresy has originated in Rome in the past eventful 19 Centuries? Let every puny carpet-bagger who carries a brief from her enemies for imaginary grievances, speak.

Americans see that the faith that avails as laid down by St. Paul, is a complete faith.

It is inconsistent for the National Church of England to declare its belief in the Catholic Church and faith (Art. VIII), and require the sovereign to declare Protestant faith on Coronation Day.

Those who disregard the Church—the Gospel Church, are in effect opposing it, and opposing Christ who requires us to hear it. "He that is not with Me is against Me."

Remember, any effort to bring back pre-Reformation Catholicity to England, without its head the Pope, is doomed to utter failure.

Remember also, that the Church built the Bible, and not that the Bible built the Church.

Whatever New Testament Scripture was written was subsequent to Christianity already established: it was dependent on the authority of the living teacher already installed.

Have the mark of the Triune God of faith impressed on you—unity; unity with God—unity with His followers.

Anglicans pray to be delivered from Schism. The way to be delivered from it, is to get out of it. To this desirable end it is to be hoped that this Appeal will be helpful.

Daily you pray that God's will be done on earth. What more blessed than to promote God's will, and especially have it fulfilled in yourself? And you know it is God's expressed will that His followers be one. Why, then, are you not manly enough and Christian enough to forthwith seek and obtain this unity, if you are not already within His fold?

How can conflicting correct creeds be formulated from the one Bible?

Join the Church, for we read that "The Lord added to the Church daily, such as should be saved." (Acts 2:47, King James Ver.)

So plain and evident is it for an Englishman to belong to the Catholic Church, that willful ignorance will not excuse him. There is nothing that will excuse him unless unwillful (invincible) ignorance.

Ask God to change, and your reason condemns you. Ask His Church—His representative—His voice in the world today—to change her truth, her doctrine, and you must feel condemnable.

While the sects have cancelled articles of their former creeds, no enemy of the Church has ever pointed out one dogma that she has cancelled. And why? Because she is "the pillar and ground of the truth." (I Tim. 3: 15.)

What grander, nobler, or more exalted than to be a part of the Mystic Body of Christ? What? What a happiness to be a member of the Church—the Spouse of Christ—the Bride of the Lamb—the Mother in this twentieth century to those who want to be Christians? What more helpful than to be nourished with the Sacraments that have their efficacy in the merits and blood of Jesus?

"I live in the faith of the Son of God, Who loved me, and delivered Himself for me." (Gal. 2:20.)

Unbeliever, let these words ever ring in your ear: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned." (Mark 16:16.)

Honestly and candidly, let us ask, "What is most worth caring for in this world?" Our Divine Saviour asks: "What doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul? Or what exchange shall a man give for his soul?" (St. Matt. 16:26.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed."—11 St. John, Ver. 10. Strong words. Eh?

"It's a rare gift to be a Catholic."—Newman.

Only what is true commands our obedience. What is false deserves no respect or obedience or conformity to it.

The action of the Church from the Council of Jerusalem to that of the Vatican shows the primacy. A dogma, pointing it out, should scarcely be necessary.

Christ plainly told the Samaritan woman that her own place of worship Gerizim was not true, that the true Temple was in Jerusalem.

So interested was the hostile press about Leo XIII in his declining years in the hope that when he would die the Papacy would die, that it is said that he always jokingly called for the daily secular paper the first thing in the morning to learn how his health was.

It may be said that there are many who believe in the unity of faith but whose lives are not in accord with its sublime truths. We may, regretfully admit this to be so, but then it is possible for these to please God by repentance whereas "without faith it is impossible to please God."

Our Lord was very much interested in what men thought of Him, or believed about Him. "Whom do men say that the Son of Man is?"—St. Matt. 16:13. He was not satisfied that they considered Him to be merely a good man "Elias or one of the prophets." "But whom do you say that I am?" And we must answer with Peter and proclaim His divinity.

While this is not an official address of those under the flag, nevertheless we are voicing their sentiments when we say they all wish for unity amongst the followers of Christ. Americans have absolute reliance on Christ's promise of co-operation with His Church. In testimony thereof there are now in Yankee land 1,500,000 children in Catholic schools under 50,000 saintly, self-sacrificing. and energetic nuns; aided by pastors, the most devoted on earth. And this host of the Lord is

supported by double and voluntary taxation yearly. Facts and figures unequalled in the history of the world.

We hope enough has been said to show that the Anglican Church is not the same as the pre-Reformation Catholic Church. We have the greatest respect, as indeed we ought, for anyone trying to acquire Catholic truth—the whole truth—about our Saviour's teaching; but then we don't admire Anglicans calling themselves Catholics for they are not. They have some Catholic truth that does not constitute them Catholics. We think Anglicans ought to be ashamed to call themselves Catholics after all they did to the Catholic Church directly or indirectly for the past few centuries.

"Let those who are satisfied that Henry was a moral man, and Cranmer an honest and intrepid Christian Bishop, be satisfied also with the religion of these Reformation Fathers; but as for us, we prefer the unreformed religion of Thomas a Becket, Anselm, Venerable Bede Alfred, Augustine and Gregory, and while we seek to vindicate our position, we shall not cease to pray that God may hasten the time when there shall again be in England, as before the Reformation, one Shepherd and one sheepfold, in union with each other, and in communion with the Church of Christ of every age and nationality."—Noble words of Rev. F. Malachy, Passionist, London.

The late Cardinal Moran, writing on Reunion, says: The Right Hon. Viscount Halifax who has made a profound study of the writers of the Church of England, attested in his Bristol address that some of her most eminent Bishops and divines have in a continuous chain ever since the separation of the 16th century, yearned for the restoration of unity, and have labored for that blessed result. He cites the words of Bishop Hammond, who regards unity "as the noblest gift of God, the grace above grace, the duty above duties, the fullness of heavenly joy," and also the words of Archbishop Bramhall who writes: "That I may live to see the Re-union of Christendom I shall ever bow the knees of my heart to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

It is pointed out to us that it is almost useless to appeal to Protestant Episcopalians to return to unity. For they are mostly descendants of those who, at the first rattle of musketry, took to flight—horse, foot and artillery; that the 5 Articles presented in 1559 were allowed to be trampled upon; and in 1562 the newly established religion held up the Book of Common Prayer to show the final repudiation of the old religion. It is pointed out to us, also, that Catholic Emancipation was won not by English but by Irish Catholics.

And that the "Second Spring" is showing scanty indication of a growth amongst the callous masses.

Nevertheless and notwithstanding let us remind persons, hampered by various surroundings, and who would fain be true to their God and obey their conscience, that under the benign influence of Divine Grace and due correspondence with it, the Redeemer's cause may advance by leaps and bounds for "this is what overcometh the world our faith."

Believing in Jesus is not only believing in His Divine personality—it is also believing in His words, His doctrine His commands, His divine arrangements, and in His Church instituted by Him to carry these into effect. Belief in Jesus necessarily implies to believe the truth about Him and not a false belief; hence the absolute necessity of a true and faithful expounder of this belief. Reference to Church then is to the one founded by the Redeemer for the world, and which is known adown history as the Church Catholic or Universal. Catholics believe more firmly than other Christians that Christ is the Head of the Church, its invisible Head since Ascension Day; and, therefore, don't have to be reminded by others that He is the Head of all the Church—in heaven, on earth and in purgatory—Head at the foundation of the Church; today; and for all time. We need not be reminded of other texts bearing on the foundation of the Church and its Headship as we had these before our minds when calling attention to the fact that Christ founded His Church on Peter as He said He would; and that He made Peter its visible head—His vicegerent, as He was about to ascend to Heaven, as the Church, guided by the Spirit of Truth, attests.

And if Jesus established a Church and established a Chief Pastorate in it through Peter, in vain are men's attacks as Gamaliel of old said at its beginning.

St. Augustine (On Baptism, III, 3:5) calls St. Cyprian "Catholic Bishop and Catholic martyr."

Of the first thirty Popes, twenty-nine were martyrs except St. Dionysius, who was the twenty-fifth.

Sooner than submit to the spoliation of the Church by Henry II, twice did St. Anselm go into exile.

Rev. Father Moeller, S. J. reminds us that Ven. (St.) Bede records that St. John of Beverly (721) England, caused a deaf and dumb youth to speak by making the sign of the cross on him.

St. Philip Neri used to salute the young priests of the English College, Rome, when starting out for England, with the hymn for the Holy Innocents "Salvete, flores Martyrum."

St. Clement of Rome, whose name is written in the Book of Life, wrote about A. D. 97: "The Apostles made these arrangements, and arranged a succession, that when they had fallen asleep other tried men should carry on the ministry."—Ep. I ad Cor., 44.

Said St. Peter Canisius: "Who would not be moved at seeing the place where Peter was fastened to the cross, where Paul was beheaded with the sword, where John was cast into a cauldron of boiling oil, where Lawrence was roasted on a gridiron, Sebastian shot with arrows."

The two earliest doctors of the English Church are **St. Aldhelm** and Ven (St.) Bede. "In vain," says St. Aldhelm, "does that man emptily glory concerning the Catholic faith, who follows not the doctrine and the rule of Peter." (Se what Ven. Bede says at p. 168.) St. Aldhelm, St. Augustine and St. Bede are yearly honored

by the Church on the 25th, 26th and 27th May respectively.

"The most precious treasure of the great church of the Minerva Rome, is the body of Saint Catherine of Siena, enshrined under the high altar in a sarcophagus of precious stone artistically carved and decorated. She died in 1380. The body is still incorrupt, as was again judicially declared by the Congregation of Rites, when examined in 1855."—New York Freeman's Journal.

It will be remembered that it was this remarkable woman that aided so successfully in bringing the Papacy back from Avignon, France.

St. Aidan of Iona, who calculated Easter by a Roman mode though an obsolete one, and St. Wilfrid, who calculated it by an improved or revised method have their offices in the Benedictine Breviary. Rev. Sidney F. Smith, S. J., tells us on the authority of (St.) Bede that Aidan's error in celebrating the Pasch was tolerated. (Was St. Aidan an Anglican? p. 16.)

The Divine Master walked on the water. So did His favored servant Peter.

Be the Angel of Good Tidings. Now will you? Spread the light. Promote unity in faith.

Of Edward I, we read that "every day he was wont to hear three Masses with music."

June 24, 1559, the solemn sacrifice, commonly called the Mass, ceased by statute throughout the length and breadth of England and Wales. This was done at the whims of a woman. It is time for Anglicans to rectify the mistake.

"Who will remember thee when thou art dead, and who will pray for thee- Whilst thou hast time heap up to thyself riches that will never die."—Thomas a Kempis. It has been said that after the Bible there is no book so popular as the "Imitation of Christ." Would

that all Christians believed with its devout author in praying for the dead!

"M. W." in "Ave Maria," Vol. 72, No. 17. It is related of William the Conqueror that, besides hearing Mass every morning, he assisted at Matins, Vespers, and the other Canonical Hours; while Hovenden tells us that Richard I, "in his better days," was accustomed to rise betimes, in order to seek first the Kingdom of God, "never leaving the church till the Offices were ended."

As we mentioned Berengarius a few times in the foregoing, it may interest our readers to note that he passed away in 1088 at peace with the Church, manifesting in his last moments the most sincere sentiments of penitence for his errors towards the Eucharist, to the great edification of his many friends. His last words were: "Today will my Lord Jesus Christ be made manifest to me, for my glory, as I humbly hope, in virtue of the penance I have done, or for my punishment, as the great number of souls whom I have led astray gives me cause to fear." Alzog, Vol. II, p. 448.

If headship of a body be necessary for legality of its enactments, and if the Pope be necessary for the legality of ecclesiastical enactments as the Councils of the Church say that he is, being the vicar of Christ, and if England accepted this headship as necessary, and as a verity in 1492, then it is evident that legislation by any society rejecting that headship is null and void ecclesiastically.

'Tis strange that the Greeks even in their present schismatical condition afford evidence of the Headship of the Papacy. Theirs is a silent, solemn indication of the Supremacy or Primacy of Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. What a spectacle! Since their Secession they have not been able to hold a General Council. Why? Because they admit their inability to hold such a Council without the presence of the Pope presiding over it. Shame on the Greeks repudiating such Headship!

If England in 1492 accepted the Papacy as a Divine arrangement, and that the Pope as successor of St. Peter was head of the Church, the rejection of that head evidently constitutes a sin.

If the headship of any society be absolutely rejected, the authority constituting that headship is, in so far, rejected, and the nature of the society is changed.

SOME CONCLUSIONS THAT LEAD TO REUNION.

The Catholic Church is the one founded by Christ and in which He lived, and He died that she might live for all time. And since He visibly walks the earth no more she it is that has been commissioned to teach for Him. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations." "He that hears you, hears Me."

If there be any one who knew what religion was right, it must be the Mother of Jesus and she was a Catholic.

If any Christian ever knew what Christ had revealed about faith and religion, it was the Apostles, and they were Catholics.

If there were any men in early Apostolic days that knew which was the right course to pursue in faith, they were Ignatius and Irenaeus, the noble martyrs, and they were Catholics.

If there were any men in the fourth and fifth centuries that knew which was the right Church, they were Chrysostom and Ambrose and Basil and Augustin and Jerome, and these were Catholics.

If there were any men who knew which was the true Church, they were such men as Augustine of Canterbury and his superior, Gregory, of the sixth and seventh centuries, and Ignatius Loyola, Francis Xavier, Charles Borromeo and Francis de Sales, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and these were Catholics.

Impartially: if Protestantism is individualism in faith and authority, does it not appear manifest that unity in Protestantism is a contradiction in terms?

Christ's mandate is not to go teach man's whims and fancies, or what may be picked up, but what He commanded.

While these pages are for the benefit of Protestants generally, we ask Anglicans especially to reconsider their position. They are in the unhappy condition effected by Tudor unworthiness, sedition, rebellion, when the rights of the Church were assailed in violation of Magna Charta, and surprising though it be these evil effects remain to the present day.

Addenda

NON-CATHOLIC SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Looking Backward.

"Let us turn to those souls where the spiritual has become predominant and all-mastering; who have breathed the upper, diviner airs; who have seen God and eternity everywhere in the world and time. How significant, when we think of it, that these are a permanent feature in the order of things; permanent, for every age produces them! Men have had to create a word to express what they stand for. The word 'saint' is in our vocabulary the greatest, the richest that is there.

"Our good Protestants need to enlarge their view point here, and to rid themselves of the supposition that the Christian life went underground at the close of the apostolic age, only to re-emerge at the Reformation. It has, they need to remember, been running all the time in a strong and glorious current. They ought to know about Ignatius and Polycarp and Justin Martyr; about Origen and Clement and Cyprian; and about Bazil and Gregory of Nazianzen and Jerome and Augustine; about Martin of Tours and St. Patrick and Venerable Bede; about Bernard and St. Francis; about Eckhart and the Brothers of the Common Life; about the Anchoress Julian of Norwich and St. Catherine of Sienna and St. Catherine of Genoa. These, out of a countless multitude less known, are examples of the saintly life, lived after the apostolic time and before the Reformation; possessed, it is true, all of them, of opnions which we no longer hold, but whose record is filled with highest inspirations, of divine facts which no earnest soul can afford to lose. Why do not our pastors, in their pulpit-teaching, deal more fully with these records? There is no richer vein. For are not these lives part of the Divine revelation—a revela-

tion embodied in heaven's action and speech through elect men and women of this earth?"—From The Outlook, a non-Catholic Journal of Dunedin, New Zealand.

George Birdwell of London, lecturing on English difficulties in India said: "If it is a question of evangelizing India, there is only one Church which can successfully do so, and that is the Roman Catholic Church; and I say this although I am not a Roman Catholic myself."

Dr. Flick, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., in his book, "The Rise of the Mediaeval Church," speaking of what are contemptuously called the Dark Ages, those centuries which every half-read critic thinks it of obligation to deride, says: "The mutual labors of scholars in correlating fields have revolutionized our historical knowledge of the early and later Middle Ages. A multitude of controverted points have vanished like ghosts. We see the old Church now as we never saw it before. The Catholic Church and the mediaeval papacy were the greatest of the creations of the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. The mediaeval Church was not exclusively a religious organization. It was more of an ecclesiastical state. It had laws, lawyers, courts, and prisons. If not born into it all the people of Western Europe were at least baptized into it. It levied taxes on its subjects. Standards of patriotism and treason were more sharply defined than in the modern state. The evolution of this great organization is the central fact of the first thirteen centuries after Christ. It aimed to control the whole life of its subjects here, and to determine their destiny hereafter. Well may our greatest American Church historian, Henry C. Lea, ask: What would have been the condition of the world if that organization had not succeeded in bearing the ark of Christianity through the wilderness of the first fifteen centuries?"

Rev. Dr. Middleton of Yonkers, N. Y., a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, wrote recently to his denominational paper, "The Living Church," a letter in which he said: "For the love of God, brethren, let us at last and for all get at the heart of the matter and call

ourselves Catholic at home and abroad. There is no reason, worthy the name, why we alone of all the communions claiming to be Catholic should use the term Protestant in the name of the church. One can understand perhaps why in a puritanical age and when party spirit ran high, a compromising title should have been adopted. But that is all past. This is the day of church unity. Protestantism is admittedly a failure. Christ's Holy Catholic church is coming into her own. Christ's prayer for the church is on the way to fulfillment. The triumph of Catholic faith is daily drawing near. Away with party spirit, timidity and compromise! If we are Catholic, let us call ourselves Catholics and act like Catholics." Rev. Dr. Middleton should remember that true Catholicity is not a mere name, but a fact capable of demonstration. Many, realizing this, have like the Garrison monastics, gone over from realms of shadowy aspiration to the existing Catholic domain, wherein is found the Savior's ideal of unity of faith.—Cath. Mess., Vol. XXVII. No. 51.

Emporia Editor's Soliloquy.

William Allen White of Emporia, Kas., on his return from Europe, presented in the paper that he publishes this thought concerning the Catholic Church, for the consideration of his fellow-Protestants, that should be useful to them all:

"The Holy Roman Catholic Church, whether we like it or dislike it, still must be admitted by serious-minded persons of every faith to be the cement that is holding civilization together. For if the influence of the Catholic Church were removed, barbarism and anarchy would arise rampant in the world. . . . The debt of civilization to the Catholic Church is the greatest single debt in the world. . . . Reverence is due to this great fundamental force in modern civilization working toward the common coming of the kingdom for which every earnest man and woman is striving, each in his own way, and, by striving, becomes the brother of all men."

A non-Catholic clergyman in Ontario, Canada, who recently asserted that the Catholic Church was not Christian, received the following rebuke from the Hamilton Herald, a Protestant journal:

"As for the statement that Roman Catholicism is not Christianity at all, is it not bitter and unfair? Consider what this implies. It means that, between the establishment of the Papacy and the dawn of the Reformation—that is, for many hundreds of years—there was virtually no Christianity in the world, certainly no organized Christianity. Surely such a statement is unfair and untrue, and we regard it as evidence of a bitter, narrow and intolerant spirit. If it was not Christianity that nourished such pure and heroic souls as the English Alfred, St. Louis of France, St. Francis of Assisi, Thomas a Kempis, Francis Xavier, Vincent de Paul, and a host of others—then Christianity must be shorn of some of its most glorious achievements."

The Conversion of India.

The Tablet notes a saying of Sir George Birdwood, an authority on all that concerns India, printed in the Daily News. Sir George, on being questioned by a representative of that paper, about a recent rather startling assertion of General Booth's, made a pronouncement on his own account. "Of course," he said, "if it is a question of evangelizing India there is only one Church which can successfully do so, and that is the Roman Catholic Church, and I say that although I am not a Roman Catholic myself." That is the opinion of "the Plain Man." The Catholic missionary has perhaps a similar though rather differently stated estimate. One such, in England, was lately asked what was wanted to convert India. His reply was immediate: "A handful of saints."—New York Freeman's Journal, Sept. 17, 1910.

"The Hope of the Earth."

The most persistent and world wide subject in Christendom today is Christian Unity, according to some plan or other. It is in the air everywhere. A

Church Unity Octave, from the feast of S. Peter's Chair (Jan. 18th) to the Conversion of S. Paul, is coming to be very widely observed in the Roman Church. The Apostolic Delegate at Washington, His Eminence D. Falconio, in writing upon this subject says: "For, indeed, it was our Blessed Savior Himself Who taught us to pray for such union when He earnestly begged His eternal Father that we all should be One and that there should be One fold and One Shepherd." Archbishop Farley of New York, speaking of the observance of this Octave also said: "It is a great pleasure for me to say that I am full of confidence in the result of such prayers." By one means or another therefore Christian Unity seems to be a hope of all the ends of the earth.—The American Catholic (Anglican).

Signs of Times Favorable for Union.

The Re-union Magazine for March, 1910, reports the President of the Ballarat Methodist Synod as saying:

"I am convinced that the goal of Anglicanism is absorption in the church of Rome, and that it is nearer than any of us imagine."

We can understand the value attached to communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, we appreciate the sentiments of history and tradition surrounding it. Let us hope that the time is not far distant in the religious future of this country when the terms of fellowship between all bodies of Christians may be very different from what they are now. Any plan to work out the unity of Christendom which passes over the Latin communion, even in English-speaking lands, would end in failure.—The N. Y. Churchman.

"Ethical ideals have been suggested to ameliorate society. The great lack in such is that men will not respond to vague ideals if the element of authority is lacking. Personal speculation and perception and desires are ridiculously inadequate in a world that is unregenerate. We simply must have some external

authority to render effective any uniform system of right."—Rev. C. P. Proudfit, First U. P. Church, Des Moines, Iowa, in "Register and Leader," Dec. 12, 1910.

Aid of Catholic Church.

The conservative attitude of the Catholic Church, says the "Catholic Citizen," Milwaukee, towards the support of the government has been long recognized. It is the foe of anarchy and the bulwark of stable government. In demanding respect for law and order, it is uncompromising. Most of the leading non-Catholic journals and monthlies admit its forceful power in combating lawlessness. A recent number of The Outlook, which has ex-President Roosevelt as one of the editors, has this to say of the power and influence of the Church:

"America today stands in peculiar need of that contribution which the Roman Catholic Church is peculiarly fitted to furnish. For the chief peril to America is from disorganizing forces and a lawless spirit; not from excessive organization. One of the chief lessons Americans need to learn is reverence for constituted authority and willing obedience to law. This lesson the Roman Catholic Church is peculiarly fitted to teach. And within the reach of its influence are those who most need to be taught. That Church is a vast spiritual police force, a protection to society from the reckless apostles of self-will. But it is far more. Wherever it goes it teaches submission to control, and that is the first step toward the habit of self-control in the individual which is an indispensable condition of self-government in the community. . . . The Outlook congratulates America upon the evidences of spiritual prosperity in the Roman Catholic Church in this country, and it gratefully appreciates the services which that Church is rendering to the community by inculcating the spirit of reverence for law and lawful authority which is the foundation of civil and religious liberty."

Christianity Will Be Strengthened by Consolidation Under a Manager.

"Over in foreign lands who can blame the poor heathen who was so confused by the rivalries of

Christian sects for his soul that he has been waiting for twenty years for someone to explain to him the difference between a Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational God.

"There is nothing that would strengthen the church more than for it to sell about 75 per cent of its meeting houses, merge its memberships in towns and communities into one organization, forget its non-essential differences in doctrine, pool its resources, wipe out half a dozen departments of home and foreign missionary work, consolidate them under no more than two boards of directors, and get a $10,000 manager who would be on the job every minute.

"It is a piece of supreme folly and always will be a losing game to encourage Christian liberty to the extent it is carried on today. No wonder it is difficult to find able men to enter the ministry. Who wants to try and live in harmony with a little bunch of cranks who would be fired out of any other organization in a month? Who can have an inspiring hope from fishing in a millpond that is hardly a foot deep?

"And similar to this foolishness, and indeed the cause of a great deal of it, is that illiberal liberal who is forever telling us how he is blazing the path of religious freedom. Every now and then someone like Tolstoi or Dr. Elliott comes out with 'my creed' or 'my religion,' and great respect for his personal goodness and large learning inclines everybody of course to the courtesy of silence.

"The biggest, broadest, cleanest, kindest, most far-sighted and far-reaching institution on this earth is and always has been the Christian church. It believes in the life and gospel of Jesus, and it is trying to interpret both, and it will convert the world. Its greatest hindrance is and always has been the self-conceited and self-righteous man or woman who is determined to organize some kind of a thing called a church around a personal opinion."—Rev. Frank E. Hopkins, Pilgrim Congregational Church, Chicago, as reported in the "Chicago Tribune," etc., Dec. 6, 1909.

[Let us remind Dr. Hopkins that there is a manager —a Chief Pastor over the Christian flock at a nameless salary; one who is a successor to him who got the Keys of the Kingdom over eighteen centuries ago from the Good Shepherd and King Himself.]

Arnold on Catholicism.

"Catholicism is that form of Christianity which is the oldest, the largest, the most popular. It has been the great popular religion of Christendom. Who has seen the poor in other churches as they are seen in Catholic churches?

"Catholicism envelops human life, and Catholics in general feel themselves to have drawn not only their religion from their Church, but they feel themselves to have drawn from her, too, their art and poetry and culture. Her hierarchy, originally stamped with the character of a beneficent and orderly authority springing amidst anarchy, appeared as offering a career where birth was disregarded and merit regarded, and the things of the mind or soul were honored, in the midst of the iron feudal age which worshipped solely birth and force. And if there is a thing specially alien to religion, it is divisions. If there is a thing specially native to religion, it is peace and union. Hence the original attraction towards unity in Rome, and hence the great charm when that unity is once attained. All these spells for the heart and imagination has Catholicism for Catholics, in addition to the consciousness of a divine cure for vice and misery."—Matthew Arnold.

What a Distinguished Briton Says.

It is appropriate here to quote a few sentences from the writings of a distinguished Englishman, W. H. Mallock:

"Reunion is the only thing to keep the sects intact —the only thing to keep them from being tossed about by every wind of doctrine." "The Church of England in its inception under Henry VIII cast aside the Papal Supremacy, the one link which binds Catholic Christianity into a logical whole."

"It is of course, a well known historical fact that all the sects at the time of the Reformation made the Bible the only supreme authority in the world; and they did this because, being but human themselves, they were unable to look into the distant future and to see upon what a treacherous and sandy bank they were building, and how soon it was destined to crum-

ble away. Slowly and yet inevitably the centuries have wrought their changes. That old foundation the Bible has ceased, in itself, to be a foundation any longer. It moves, it shifts, it totters. It will support no structure unless something outside itself shall be found which will support it. That something the Roman Church supplied, and now reformed Christendom is beginning at last to find that, for that something which it rejected and still rejects, it is necessary to find a substitute" ("Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption," p. 79). For, he says elsewhere, "Until they (Protestants) can tell us definitely, coherently, and fully on what foundations their belief and the interpretation of the Bible rests, all the emphasis they expend in assorting their rival doctrines is as meaningless as the crowing of cocks in a farmyard."

That Church Unity is in the air even the secular press gives almost daily evidence. The following is a sample from the Evening Tribune of Providence, R. I. (April 28, 1911):

Former Chief Justice Stiness of this city and former Chief Justice Simeon E. Baldwin of the Supreme Court of Connecticut, who resides in New Haven, spoke before the Unitarian Club last night and both advocated in strong terms the union of the Protestant denominations. Judge Stiness pointed out the Layman's Missionary Movement as one of the significant signs of recent times so far as church unity is concerned.

Judge Baldwin during the course of his address spoke as follows:

"From one point of view, even Protestants must admit that Christendom was weakened by the Reformation. The followers of Christ had been for fifteen centuries substantially united in one form of worship, under one system of ecclesiastical organization. They fell apart, not so much because they differed in theology as because half of them thought the mode of administering that authority had become hopelessly corrupt.

"I am by no means sure that the world has been the better because Luther overbore Erasmus, and so the Church was not, as Erasmus would have had it, reformed from within. There is something very im-

pressive still in this venerable, world-wide Roman Church, clinging to the same body of traditions; maintaining the use of the universal, Roman tongue in its ritual; comforting the dying with a priestly pardon for all their sins."

THE VOICE OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

Oh, the joy and peace and consolation of believing!

* * * *

Weary heart, art thou lonely amid the shadows of midnight? Yet a little while and the birds of morning shall sing unto thee of peace.—"Thistledrift."

A preacher in Chicago announced to his people last Sunday that sectarianism was dying out and it would not be very long before the world would be Catholic again. He has his people to pray every Sunday for God's blessing on the Catholic Church.—Western Watchman, Vol. 44, No. 36.

In the quadrennial review of the Methodist Church, South, just issued from Asheville, the members are congratulated on many things that appear airy nothings to an ordinary outsider, and simple nonsense to anyone who takes time to think. For instance, the Methodists of the country are congratulated because: "Happily Methodism has never had a doctrinal schism." Take nothing from nothing and nothing remains. The Methodists boast that they have no articles of faith. How can blind men dispute about color? We next will hear the hens congratulating themselves that they never have the toothache.—W. Watchman.

I thank Thee, O my God, that Thou hast strung
My soul's loud lyre of faith that yearns to Thee;
That Thou hast put hope singing on my tongue,
And in my heart waked song of charity.
I thank Thee for all light upon me shone,

For friendship, health and joy that round me chant,
For triumphs in my toil, however scant,—
Yea, for the power to lift unto Thy throne
The voice of pleading in all worthy aims,
And to extol Thy name above all names.
—Richard O'Malley, the Blind Poet of Pennsylvania, in New York "Freeman's Journal."

May Redeem the Name George.

"It is our personal belief—one shared with millions of others—that George V will prove a good king," says the "True Witness," of Montreal. "He is, we think, every inch a man, and has certainly given Europe the good example of a hitherto well-spent life. The name of George needs redemption on the English throne, and its fifth bearer gives promise of a cheering story."—(Quoted approvingly by the "S. Heart Review," Boston.)

The Shipwreck of Protestantism.

Protestantism in our day might be likened to a ship stranded on a reef, whose hinder part is being broken to pieces by the fierce winds, and yet we may not reasonably hope that the going to pieces of Protestantism will be accompanied by a miraculous intervention of Divine Providence, such as accompanied the famous shipwreck recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, where St. Paul obtained from God the life of all on board the doomed vessel. Two methods of salvation from the hungry sea are to be noted:

1. The Individual Method.

"But the centurion . . . commanded that they who could swim, should cast themselves first into the sea, and same themselves and get to land."

2. The Corporate Method.

"And the rest, some they carried on boards, and some on those things that belonged to the ship."

The Total Result.

"And so it came to pass that every soul got safe to land." Acts xxvii:43,44. Douay Version.

Evidences are not wanting that the mind of the non-Papal world is undergoing an enormous change of attitude towards the Catholic Church at the present time. The deep and bitter prejudices of other days are van-

ishing on every hand. Protestant systems of belief are crumbling into dust. One of the straws upon the surface which shows the way the tide is running is the disposition on the part particularly of the Anglicans, or Episcopalians, to rid themselves of the name of Protestant, as something to be ashamed of, and to insist on being called Catholics. Surely the hand of God is in all this. A psychological and mental conversion is silently taking place by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, which justifies the confident hope that in a short time a corporate movement among English-speaking Christians towards the Holy See will manifest itself that will eventuate in the conversion of not thousands, but of millions.

Meanwhile the Holy Father, as the successor of St. Peter, stands upon the shore, eager "to restore all in Christ" and gifted by God with the wisdom and the ability to receive a family, a congregation, a church or a nation into Catholic communion as readily as the individual convert.—Paulus, in St. John's Quarterly.

The Humor Of It.

A correspondent, W. D. Gainsford, writing to the *Tablet* thus states the case of Protestants claiming the title of "Catholic:"

"A company of men seceded from the Catholic Church in 1559, repudiated their former membership, repudiated the very doctrines that qualified for membership, and passed an Act of Parliament constituting themselves a new body distinct from, and opposed to, the Catholic Church; and then proceeded to appropriate the lands and nomenclature, the churches and phrases, the tithes and titles that were the property of that Catholic Church in England."

Read the Words of Leo XIII to the Orientals.

The principal subject of contention is the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. But let them look back to the early years of their existence, let them consider the sentiments entertained by their forefathers, and examine what the oldest traditions testify, and it will, indeed, become evident to them that Christ's Divine utterance, **Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,** has undoubtedly been realized in the

Roman Pontiffs. Many of these latter in the first ages of the Church were chosen from the East, and foremost among them Anacletus, Evaristus, Anicetus, Eleutherius, Zosimus, and Agatho; and of these a great number, after governing the Church in wisdom and sanctity, consecrated their ministry with the shedding of their blood. The time, the reasons, the promoters of the unfortunate division are well known. Before the day when man separated what God had joined together, the name of the Apostolic See was held in reverence by all the nations of the Christian world; and the East, like the West, agreed without hesitation in its obedience to the Pontiff of Rome, as the legitimate successor of St. Peter, and, therefore, the Vicar of Christ here on earth.

And, accordingly, if we refer to the beginning of the dissension, we shall see that Photius himself was careful to send his advocates to Rome on the matters that concerned him; and Pope Nicolas I. sent his legates to Constantinople from the Eternal City, without the slightest opposition, "in order to examine the case of Ignatius the Patriarch with all diligence, and to bring back to the Apostolic See a full and accurate report;" so that the history of the whole negotiation is a manifest confirmation of the primacy of the Roman See with which the dissension then began. Finally, in two great Councils, the second of Lyons and that of Florence, Latins and Greeks, as is notorious, easily agreed, and all unanimously proclaimed a dogma, the supreme power of the Roman Pontiffs.

Americans Surprised at the Coincidence.

(By substituting a few words, such as Sts. Anselm, Aidan and Thomas in the following address of Leo XIII. to the Orientals, we see how appropriately they can be applied to Anglicans.)

May God, then, in His goodness, hear the prayer that you yourselves address to Him: "Make the schisms of the Churches cease," and "Assemble those who are dispersed, bring back those who err, and unite them to Thy Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." May you thus return to that one holy faith which has been handed down both to us and to you from time

immemorial; which your forefathers preserved untainted, and which was enhanced by the rival splendor of the virtues, the great genius, and the sublime learning of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzum and St. John Chrysostom, the two Saints who bore the name of Cyril, and so many other great men whose glory belongs as a common inheritance to the East and to the West.

The Motto of All Who Follow Christ.

Ut omnes unum sint is becoming more and more the motto of all who still esteem the religion of Jesus Christ. The secular press is watching this new move towards a reunited Christendom with keen interest. The Dallas News, one of the leading secular papers of the South, informed its readers a few days ago that an Episcopalian bishop (Dr. Greer of New York) had requested all his clergy to preach on a certain Sunday upon the necessity of church unity—as the world can never be brought to Christ by a divided Christianity.

Certainly it needs no theologian to prove this. An illiterate man, gifted with ordinary common sense, will say the same. The prayers which were said during the Church Unity Octave (from St. Peter's Chair to St. Paul's Conversion) and which are daily continued by zealous souls for the reunion of Christendom, are beginning to bear fruit. Let us go on with a good courage.

The will of Jesus Christ is becoming so clearly recognized by all His followers, that only His enemies will any longer seek to impede the glorious fulfillment of the Saviour's prayer, until unity in the one fold of the Catholic Church under the one supreme Shepherd, the Successor of Blessed Peter, will be throughout the world the universal test of Christian discipleship.

Raymond Vernimont.

Denton, Texas. In the "Lamp," New York.

"Unauthorized" Protestant Services.

The Anglican Bishop of Chichester is a practical man. He is aware that Anglican differs from Anglican, that that curious standard of Christian orthodoxy, the

Prayer Book, is not regarded as very binding by Anglican rectors and congregations, and that a process of "revision" is going on on all sides. It is prompted by the private judgment of the clergy or the likings of the congregations. To attempt to introduce uniformity would be to undertake a hopeless task. But the spectacle of Anglican differences is not edifying. There are grumblings and protests that Protestantism is steadily evaporating. The Bishop of Winchester sees not how the evaporation can be prevented, but he thinks he discovers in the situation an opportunity for the extension of Anglican episcopal influence. He has, therefore, intimated in a New Year's Pastoral that he will ask the clergy for copies of any services used by them in church which are not in the Prayer Book. His purpose is, as far as is consistent with loyalty to the spirit of the Prayer Book, "not to forbid, but rather to give the clergy the episcopal recognition which is at present wanting." So that presumably his Lordship, in a comprehensive spirit truly Protestant, will, as far as he can, tender his approval to all the variations of Anglican worship.—London C. Times, January 7, 1910.

UNION AMONG CHRISTIANS.

Cardinal Gibbons Commends the Idea of Church Union. Only One Way to Bring it About.

In his sermon, December 4, 1910, at the Baltimore Cathedral, Cardinal Gibbons commended the Episcopal Church, which, he said he had been told, advocated in strong and earnest language the union of the various Christian churches. He declared that unity should be the goal of all churches, but said that this was only possible when all Christians should recognize one chief pastor.

Taking as his text the verse from St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith," the Cardinal said:

"It was manifestly the desire of Christ that all His disciples should be united in the profession of one faith. In His admirable prayer before His passion He says, 'I

pray for them also who through their word shall believe in Me, that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me;' because the unity of the church is the most luminous evidence of the divine mission of Christ.

"In St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians he insists also upon unity of faith in the following language: 'Be careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all.'

"Unity of government is not less essential to the Church of Christ, than unity of doctrine. Our divine Savior never speaks of His churches, but of His church. He does not say, 'Upon this rock I will build My churches,' but, 'Upon this rock I will build My church,' from which words we must conclude that it never was His intention to establish or to sanction various conflicting denominations, but one corporate body, with all the members united under one visible head; for as the church is a visible body, it must have a visible head.

"The church is called a kingdom; 'He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.' Now in every well-regulated kingdom there is but one king, one form of government, one uniform body of laws, which all are obliged to observe. In like manner, in Christ's spiritual kingdom, there must be one chief to whom all owe spiritual allegiance; one form of ecclesiastical government; one uniform body of laws which all Christians are bound to observe; for 'every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate.'

"Our Savior calls His church a sheepfold. 'And there shall be made one fold and one shepherd.' What more beautiful or fitting illustration of unity can we have than that which is suggested by a sheepfold? All the sheep of a flock cling together. If they are momentarily separated, they are impatient till reunited. They follow in the same path. They feed on the same pastures. They obey the same shepherd, and fly from the voice of strangers. So did our Lord intend that all the sheep of His fold should be nourished by the same sacraments and the same bread of life; that they should

follow the same rule of faith as their guide to Heaven; that they should listen to the voice of one Chief Pastor, and that they should carefully shun false teachers.

"His church is compared to a human body. 'As in one body we have many members, but all the members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of the other.' In one body there are many members, all inseparably connected with the head. The head commands and the foot instantly moves, the hand is raised and the lips open. Even so our Lord ordained that His church, composed of many members, should be all united to one supreme visible head, whom they are bound to obey.

"The church is compared to a vine, all whose branches, though spreading far and wide, are necessarily connected with the main stem, and from its sap they are nourished. In like manner, our Savior will have all the saplings of His vineyard connected with the main stem, and all draw their nourishment from the parent stock.

"In fact our common sense alone, apart from revelation, is sufficient to convince us that God could not be the author of various opposing systems of religion. God is essentially one. He is Truth itself. 'God is not the God of dissension, but of peace.' I see perfect harmony in the laws which govern the physical world that we inhabit. I see a marvelous unity in our planetary system. Each planet moves in its own sphere, and all are controlled by the central sun.

"Why should there not be also harmony and concord in that spiritual world, the church of God, the grandest conception of His omnipotence and the most bounteous manifestation of His goodness and love for mankind!

"Hence it is clear that Jesus Christ intended that His church should have the one common doctrine which all Christians are bound to believe, and one uniform government to which all should be loyally attached.

"Where, then, shall we find this essential unity of faith and government? I answer, confidently, nowhere save in the Catholic Church.

"The number of Catholics in the world is computed at 250,000,000. They have all one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one creed. They receive the same sacraments, they worship at the same altar, and pay spiritual allegi-

ance to one common Head. Should a Catholic be so unfortunate as contumaciously to deny a single article of faith, or withdraw from the communion of his legitimate pastors, he ceases to be a member of the church and is cut off like a withered branch. The church had rather sever her right hand than allow any member to corrode her vitals. She says to her children: 'You may espouse any political party you choose; with this I have no concern,' but as soon as they trench on matters of faith she cries out: 'Hereto thou shalt come, and shalt go no farther; and here thou shalt break thy swelling waves of discord.' The temple of faith is the asylum of peace, concord and unity.

"How sublime and consoling is the thought that whithersoever a Catholic goes over the broad world, whether he enters her church in Peking or in Melbourne, in London, or Dublin, or Paris, or Rome, or New York, or San Francisco, he is sure to hear the selfsame doctrine preached, to assist at the same sacrifice, and to partake of the same sacraments.

"This is not all. Her creed is now identical with what it was in past ages. The same Gospel of peace that Jesus Christ preached on the Mount; the same doctrine that St. Peter preached at Antioch and Rome; St. Paul at Ephesus; St. John Chrysostom at Constantinople; St. Augustin in Hippo; St. Ambrose in Milan; St. Remigius in France; St. Boniface in Germany; St. Athanasius in Alexandria; the same doctrine that St. Patrick introduced into Ireland, that St. Augustine brought into England, and St. Pelagius into Scotland, and which Columbus took with him to the New World, is ever preached in the Catholic Church throughout the globe, from January till December—'Jesus Christ yesterday, and today, and the same forever.'"

The Kingdom of God on earth, while not of this world is in this world for us men and our salvation. Evidently such expression as "foreign bishop" is a wrong expression for Christians towards him who holds the headship in the one Kingdom.

An American Archbishop on Modernism.

His Grace, Most Rev. John Ireland of St. Paul, preaching at the Consecration of Rt. Rev. E. D. Kelly, recently, in the "University City" of Ann Arbor, Mich., on the need of the Supernatural in this age of unbelief, thus refers to Modernism—the menace:

"To preach the supernatural is the mission of the Church of Christ—the Catholic Church—and this mission the Catholic Church follows out in manner most conspicuous. The proof today that the Catholic Church is the Church founded by Christ to guard His teachings—we see it in the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the supernatural. The Catholic Church is today the sole authoritative body raising its voice in behalf of the supernatural, proclaiming it in trumpet tones that all must hear.

"On the Vatican hill stands the chieftain, ever quick to observe the approach of danger, ever quick to sound the alarm. We have listened to the encyclicals of Pius X. on modernism. The question is one of modernism in religion, of theories with regard to the supernatural that impair its integrity, demolish its objective realities, alter it in its vital claims from the faith once delivered to the saints. In the religion of the supernatural there is no room for modernism. It is the religion of God, as He was from eternity; the religion of Jesus Christ, as Jesus preached it 1,900 years ago; the religion of the Church of Jesus Christ as she received it from the founder, as she since has preached it in unalloyed purity and undiminished fullness. The religion of the supernatural is assailed by open and covert foe. The former would blot it out altogether from the thoughts of men; the latter, they say, would give it new life by changing it into new forms, more apt to please the philosophies of modern times. Modernists in religion would see in God an emanation of Kantian subjectivism; in the Divinity of Christ, an effusion of exalted faith; in the Church of Christ, an accretion from human traditions, from human

imaginings. Help of this kind the Church will not accept; it were fatal to the truth. And so, from the summit of the Vatican, Pius X. hurls anathemas against all who either deny the supernatural, or disfigure its principles and teachings. God lives in the supreme, infinitive objectivity, to be known by reason in contemplation of His power, wisdom and goodness as manifested in His works. Jesus Christ lives—manifest in the full objectivity of His Divinity, through His prophecies and miracles. The Church teaches from authority received from Jesus Christ, and in His name, the truths entrusted to her vigilant keeping. This the meaning, this the purport of the encyclicals of Pius X. Who, knowing the jealous care in which he watched over the sacred deposit, the fearlessness with which he speaks out in defense, will not admire him, will not proffer him love and gratitude? The Vatican silent, the supernatural were without defender, whose voice should reach unto the confines of nations, whose word should thrill the hundreds of millions, and set them in battle array to guard, at all cost, at all sacrifice, the truths and the rights of the supernatural."

Action, Catholics, Strong and Immediate Action.

We append to this Appeal extracts from an article in the "Western Watchman," St. Louis, edited, as is well known, by Rev. D. S. Phelan, LL. D. They are from one of his weekly interesting sermons, this subject being "The Glory and Joy of Well-doing."

"The social question or problem divides the world today into two great schools of religious thought, viz:—those who reject God, and those who accept Him.

"The dividing line then is one of religion. The men of the world want a perfect human society, but bar God from membership. The people of the Church want a perfect human society, but God is the first member admitted. The one would get along without God, the others want to live with God in time and eternity. There is the dividing line.

"Now, these two great social movements are going forward side by side. The irreligious mass are working and thinking and planning and plotting for the conquest of the world; they want this world all to themselves. Read the literature of the atheistic press and you will find they have one ambition, and that is to have all this world to themselves. They want to rule here absolutely, they want to bring all men under their sway, and create a condition of things here that will redound to the universal happiness of all; but they want no God, they want no Church, they want no faith, they want no supernatural, and they want no soul. You cannot understand, you cannot appreciate the extent of the time and energy, and money spent in bringing about this atheistic commonwealth, this unchristian society.

"But what are we doing to promote the interests of our society? What are we doing for the Christian commonwealth? What are we doing for the brotherhood of Christian men? What are we doing for religion? What are we doing for God's Church? What are we doing to promote the interests of this great society, the first name on the roster of which is God, the second name Jesus Christ, and the third name the Church? * * *

"There is enthusiasm outside the Church. The enemies of the Church are filled with zeal, the men who hate the priests have a heart filled with the high spirit of their antagonism. Those outside the Church are engaged in a warfare against her, and they are spurred on by the spirit of the conflict; and they look forward with ecstatic joy to the time when they will have accomplished her destruction. There is no denying the fact that those outside the Church of God, those who hate her and those who hate God who founded her, are animated with an enthusiasm, and they manifest it in works and in sacrifices. They glory in every discomfiture of the Church, they glory in every misfortune of the Faith, they glory when the name of God is dishonored, they glory when virtue is trampled under foot; they have a satanic joy in the success of their work.

"And we, the opposing army, fighting under the standard of the Cross, following the leadership of Jesus Christ, when have we manifested the enthusiasm, the martial

spirit, that seeks conflict and glories in achievement? We are doing what we do through compulsion, not through love. The result is we accomplish little."

Perhaps some one may say "Catholics make too much of the Church." It surely cannot be wrong to recognize the power and authority conferred on the Church. We are satisfied to acknowledge the stupendous power given her by the Master Himself. And if any blame can be attached let it be attached to Him who lovingly said: "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth. As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." What authority can any creature confer on the Church comparable to this? But as we recognize the Church as a Gospel institution and hence regard it incumbent on every one to attend to her instructions and not become separated from her, let us hear what others have to say to the maxim, " outside the Church there is no salvation."

The Helvetic (Swiss) Confession of Faith of 1565 says: "There is no salvation outside of the Church, as there was no salvation outside of the Ark; if man desires life, he must not separate himself from the true Church of Jesus Christ." The Saxon Confession, that of Belgium, that of Scotland, are no less explicit: "Outside of the Church," says the Calvinistic Catechism of the 17th century, "there is nothing but damnation; all those who separate themselves from the communion of the Faithful to form a sect apart, cannot hope for salvation as long as they remain separated." Moreover, Calvin himself affirms, in his "Institutions" "that outside of the Church man cannot hope for the pardon of sins nor his salvation." See Gousset: De l'Eglise (The Church). Quotations from "Christian Apologitics." Devirier, p. 568.

As Herod and Pilate were one against Christ, so are the Jew and the pagan—the infidel and atheist—one against His Church.

THE TYRANNY OF THE POPES.

Ancient Bugaboo Still Frightens Many Good Folks. "The Tyranny of Rome" a Worn-Out Scarecrow.

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The Great Desideratum of the Day. How Religious Authority Makes Unification Possible.

On these subjects V. Rev. A. P. Doyle, the Paulist Father, writes most interestingly:

The Spiritual Tyranny of Rome.

The thing that many religionists seem to dread nowadays, is the spiritual tyranny of Rome. It is current coin with them to present Rome as a huge medieval despotism overpowering and autocratic, demanding the blindest submission to its dictates, and entering into all the secret relationships of men's lives, and crushing any individuality; in fact a system not at all adapted to the free atmosphere of the Twentieth Century America. And yet to us, within the Church, who are lovers of liberty, which as Leo XIII once said, is God's noblest gift to men, we know nothing of, and have never felt, these throttling bands of spiritual tyranny. On the contrary, Rome's authority, to us, is very paternal and as benign and loving as the rule of a kind Father over his own household. This strong and yet paternal care safeguards the peace and quiet, security and contentment of our great Church-Home.

Value of Authority.

It is only in such a peaceful atmosphere as is created by well-established Church authority that the garden of virtue may be cultivated. It is impossible to gather a harvest of rich religious fruitage where fierce quarrels prevail, any more than one can raise a harvest on the sides of a belching volcano. The high and shifting winds of changing and unstable doctrine kill the delicate plants as the storms prostrate the trees and uproot the flowers. Instability of doctrine is as perni-

cious to the growing grain as the fickle wave would be. Papal authority gives strength, productiveness and growth in religious things. Its only office is so to establish Christ in the hearts of men, that all things may be restored in Him.

In financial matters, there is no condition of affairs that is more to be dreaded in this country, than an everchanging character of the bases of value. Tariff tinkering always produces hard times, because no merchant will place advance orders when prices are going to tumble about his head. It is just as true in the religious world. Shifting dogmas, and creedless lives give no stability to religious faith and practices. It is not spiritual tyranny that the Catholic suffers from, but it is the blissful joy of a secure faith in which there is no wavering, no doubts, but solid securities. When values are uncertain, capital flees away, for it is as shy as the birds, and they hide away when the storm rages. An undoubting and secure faith is necessary for salvation, for without faith it is impossible to please God, and this is Our Lord's sole reason for establishing an unerring teaching authority. This country would not be livable without the Supreme Court to establish the principles of law and settle contentions between citizens. Everything would be in a state of flux; property would lose its value; law would no longer be respected, and anarchy would prevail. And yet why should a state of affairs be desirable in the religious world, that we would not countenance for a moment in civil life? Supremacy, infallibility, inerrancy, are all one. Each one postulates the other. There is no more beautiful religious and consoling reading in all the world than that of the Holy Bible. It is the supreme master of the lives of men, but an infallible Bible is not a safeguard without an infallible interpreter. The Constitution needs a Supreme Court to tell us of its meaning. The Pope never has, nor never can, teach anything that is against the Bible. The Bible is his compass to guide men to heaven; he but interprets it for the world. He is the Captain of the Ship, and the Bible is his means of reckoning, and by it, he lays out our course. It would be anarchy on board ship if every passenger would seek to determine the ship's place and to lay out its route, and insist that his way must be followed.

No Unity Without A Head.

In religion, there is nothing more desirable than Christian unity. Hard-headed Americans see in the multiplicity of churches in the small towns, duplicating each others' efforts, thwarting each others' purposes and destroying each others' aims, a waste of good money and good men. They say that nothing is more desirable than union and consolidation and co-ordination of churches. Nothing makes so much for unified efforts, as the intelligent direction of a central authority. Centrifugal forces in the religious world have prevailed overmuch with the result that the land is bestrewn with isolated and etiolated churches, where if some mighty syndicate could gather them together under a central bureau, eliminate the unnecessary force, and the internal discord, and face them all against Christianity's common foe, the growing infidelity and paganism of the day, then we could proudly defend our claim to be a Christian country. But that religious syndicate must have a Divine authority, be inerrant in its teaching, and forceful in its authority. Christian unity would be a blessed thing, the Blessed Christ Himself prayed earnestly for it. The most noble souls in the Christian fields have consecrated their lives to bring it about, but the greatest non-Catholic theologian of the day said to me once: "There is no effective road to Christian unity, except through the Old Mother Church of Christendom; she must open her arms and take them back." There is an attempt made to secure similarity by eliminating differences, but there is no unity where there is no head. There is no fold without a shepherd; there is no army without a general; there is no navy without an admiral; no ship without a captain; no state without a chief magistrate. And so in the religious world, there can be no order, harmony or effectual religious work without a Supreme Court. We have yet to see the American who speaks of the political tyranny of the Supreme Court of the United States, and we have yet to meet the Catholic who complains of the spiritual tyranny of Rome."

THE REAL REFORMER.

The Church is God's reformation of man. She watches over him from the cradle to the grave. The Catholic "re-

former," Priest or layman, strives to bring back to their senses and to their duties the very many Catholics who pursue the wrong in devious ways, while knowing the right. One of the greatest reformers in the Catholic Church was the wonder worker Saint Catherine of Sienna—who brought the Pope himself from Avignon back to Rome! Perhaps, in no other one life, among the followers of Christ, do we find such outspoken truth about the abuses of riches and power; such blasting censure of cruelty and cowardice; such fearless arraignment of the high and mighty (whether Pope, King, Queen or Prelate) for unreadiness to face wrong and right it; united to such rigorous austerity and complete self-effacement. This marvelous work of "reformation" was done for the whole Christian world and of all time, by a little white nun, who entered a severe religious order (the Dominican) at 17 years old—and who died at 31.

Her task was to make all Christians follow Christ humbly and sincerely, and to make the Temple of God a sacred place. She took the scourge in her hand and used it fearlessly to drive out the evil spirits of pride, vain-glory and hypocrisy.

Five hundred years ago there was much of this work to do, and there is still, and there always will be. If Protestants will only come back to Holy Church they will find plenty of opportunity to reform both themselves and others!

They can do as much as Martha and pray as much as Mary. There is no limit to either work or prayer in the Catholic Church, whose faith is that perfect freedom which serves both God and man.

Saint Catherine of Sienna wrote many letters (several hundred), but she wrote one little prayer (her only poetry) which shows the source of all her inspiration:

"Nearer to God, His will to serve,
Spirit Divine, my spirit draw;
Inflame my heart with love and awe,
From sinful thoughts my soul preserve!
Lord God, uplifted by Thy might,
My faltering courage waxes bold
To front all ills that life may hold;
Oh, Christ, my love! Oh, Christ, my Light!"

—Maria Longworth Storer, in the "Lamp," N. Y.

A PROTESTANT WITNESS.

Rev. George Parkin Atwater, an Episcopal clergyman, of Akron, Ohio, instead of agreeing with the complaint of lack of men in the ministry thinks there is too many and cites in the October **Atlantic** cases of villages of only five thousand people that have as many as ten churches and ten ministers. Pleading earnestly for the union of churches, he shows how "the Christian forces by divisions and subdivisions are becoming the source of vast woe and distress to themselves. It is not too much to say that the principle of subdivision into sects is destructive of Christianity. It subverts authority and it weakens faith."

From a Protestant minister these are strong words, but they are no less true than those he writes not long after, as he regards admiringly the example of effective administration afforded by Roman Catholics. "In cities where they equal in number the other Christians they have fewer churches," he attests, "and fewer priests. And the churches are filled, because the Roman Catholics have preserved the principle of authority, which the denominational system has entirely broken down."

Doubtless. But the diluted Christianity that would necessarily result from the union of those ten Protestant sects would hardly give birth to the principle of authority that is so desirable.—America, Vol. 6, No. 1.

The Rev. Dr. N. M. Waters, a Congregationalist minister of Brooklyn, recently delivered a discourse on "Bernard of Clairvaux," in which he paid this warm tribute to the monks of the "dark ages":

"Out of the monasteries came the printing press; out of the monasteries came the universities; out of the monasteries came the libraries; out of the monasteries came modern science; out of the monasteries came the prayer-book, the Litany, the Te Deum. It was in the monasteries the foundations of English literature were laid. It was in a monastery that the first New Testament was written. It was in a monastery that the Bible was first translated into English. The monk, with the life of the recluse, was the great figure in the Dark Ages. Under God he was the great architect of civilization. . . . .

" . . These monks were scholars. These monks had the time and the learning and the devotion in an age when there were no books to seek out for all the sources of the Bible, and to copy and illumine old letters and old manuscripts. Take all the manuscripts from which our modern Bible is derived, which have had such a strange story of preservation; not one of them would exist today had it not been for the fidelity and the scholarship of the monks of the Middle Ages. They kept learning alive. They wrote the only books in that time. Some of them are alive still. Many of our hymns come down from those distant ages. Our 'Jerusalem the Golden' came from the pen of the Abbot of Cluny. It was Bernard of Clairvaux who wrote 'O Sacred Head Now Wounded.' "—America, Vol. 6, No. 6.

THE CHARITY OF THE CHURCH.

Although the Church has all power and authority to teach from Christ, yet she has been charitable ever. She must uphold Catholic truth with her anathema, as did Paul of old, but she is ever kind toward mortals. Read what Mallock, a Protestant historian, writes: "There is no point, probably, connected with this question about which the general world is so misinformed, and ignorant, as the sober and boundless charity of what is know as the Anathematizing Church. Never was there a religious body, except the Roman, that laid such stress on all its dogmatic teachings, yet had the justice that comes of sympathy, for those who cannot receive them. The holy and humble of heart who do not know her, or in good faith reject her, she commits confidently to God's Mercy. Her anathemas are on none but those who with open eyes reject her, tampering with the conviction that she is really the truth. These are condemned not for not seeing that the teacher is true, but having seen this, they close their eyes, not willing to obey, when they know that they ought to obey."

NEITHER ANNIHILATED NOR "CONVERTED."

Describing and emphasizing the devotion of the Catholics of Ireland to their religion Chief Secretary Birrell in a speech recently in England, is reported to have said:

"After studying Ireland for many years the main feeling left in my mind is how, after all the fighting and revolution and confiscation and menace, after all the Penal Laws and famines and tithe wars and Coercion Acts, after the destruction of native industries and the yearly drain on the population by emigration, there are still in Ireland four and a half million of people, and that the majority of them still adhere to their old religion. Such tenacity of faith is, I believe, almost unexplainable in the history of the whole world. From the time of Elizabeth almost down to the time of Victoria to be a Catholic in Ireland was to be an outcast. They (the Catholics) were robbed of their land, they were given their choice between hell and Connacht; they were ousted from portions of Ulster in favor of Scotchmen, and they were killed or banished whenever opportunity offered. But they were neither annihilated nor converted, and yet from the time of Elizabeth downwards to our own day they enjoyed all the blessings (?) of the Protestant Establishment. They had four (Protestant) Archbishops, between twenty and thirty Bishops, I do not know how many Deans, and a parochial clergy, all supported by tithes wrung out of wretched tenants, none of whom ever entered the place of worship to which they were compelled to contribute."

And the Irish are today a power to be reckoned with. Plainly here is the hand of God. Americans appreciate this noble tribute, to a people that are the admiration of the world today, for their loyalty to God, their attachment to their Church, their devotion to the right the good, and the true. Yes, to Ireland can be applied the words of the prophet: "I, the Lord have called thee in justice, and taken thee by the hand and preserved thee. And I have given thee for a covenant to the people, for a light of the Gentiles."—Isaias 42:6.

HONEST WORDS AND GOOD SENSE.

How are American Protestants going to face the fact of the rapid increase in power of the Catholic Church? What is to be their attitude toward "this universal neighbor?"

A Protestant pastor with a Celtic name, Rev. Dr. Frederick Lynch, sees things already. "Is our attitude,"

he asks, "to be one of hostility and prejudice, such as our fathers entertained, or one of utmost cordiality and friendliness as to one of the same faith as ourselves?"

"Are we going to waste our energies fighting a church which follows the same Master," he continues, "or unite with them against the common enemy of all good?" In The Christian Work and Evangelist (New York), Dr. Lynch, who writes "The Optimist's" column, deals in the following broad-minded way with the question: having first discussed the hostility, bigotry and falsehood manifested toward the Church, in his boyhood in his New England home.

"When he (a Protestant) sees the paganism in our great cities, the utter indifference to religion of thousands of men, the worship of pleasure and the frenzy of the masses over sports, the frivolity of our modern life, the growing evil of divorce, the lessening sense of sin, the graft and corruption in business, the heedlessness of law amounting almost to anarchy, the denial on all sides of the sacrificial life as the true creed of humanity, he thanks God that the Catholic Church is strong, for she is set like a flint against all these real menaces of our modern life.

"He had infinitely rather see her churches multiplying in Chicago than to see the low music halls, the gorgeous cafes, the halls of pleasure, and gilded halls of champagne and vice, and theaters, given over to nastiness, multiplying on every side. He had a thousand times rather see her preacher of judgment and of the righteousness God demands of men preaching on every corner than to have Nietzsche, Bernard Shaw, and Mrs. Glynn gaining increasing hold upon our people. This is what we Protestants have got to remember.

"We Christians have got a long, arduous, and fierce task before us in this century of combating the all-prevalent materialism with idealism, the widespread Epicureanism with the gospel of service and of mission. Are we going to waste our energy and our feelings in hating that which, in spite of some doctrines and practices, which we dislike, is with us, on our side, instead of welcoming any ally in the fight against the sin of the world?

"For, fundamentally, the Roman Church believes as we do: God, righteousness, the sacrificial life, the forgiveness of sin, Christ the only Saviour of humanity,

the unparted life of God, eternity in our hearts, the immortality of the soul. For our part, we have no time to waste in hating another Christian Church while we stand almost despairing before the thousand enemies of Christ.

"We count as our friend and fellow worker the great and good Cardinal Gibbons, when he says that the Catholic Church 'stands for law and order, for liberty, for social justice, for purity. It works for the loyal observance of the Constitution, and obedience to the government. It seeks to make better citizens, to destroy civic corruption, to spread the doctrines of right living and right thinking. It uses its vast influence to incorporate into the body politic the hordes of immigrants that come through our gates. By word and action it propagates the virtues of justice and charity. . . . Striving to maintain the home, that unit of a strong nation, she has vigorously condemned divorce, permitting only that kind of dissolution of the marriage bonds which is known as separation from bed and board.' "—"Catholic Citizen."

RIDICULOUS.

To read something good in the Bible and then to say the Bible endorses the opposite. (Such as "Hear the Church"; "Obey your Prelates," and then to say the Bible endorses the overthrow of the Church and disobedience to Prelates having Apostolic succession.)

To exercise your will in the reading of the Scriptures and then to deny free will.

To claim that faith alone saves, when your adversary points out that you are wanting in faith—"in the faith once delivered to the Saints."

To claim that the various sects of Christians with as many conflicting minds in them as sects and individuals therein, nevertheless constitute one body. There is one Mystical Body having only one mind.

"Be of one mind."

THE MOTHER OF SACRED SCIENCE.

The following are the national Colleges at present in Rome with the date of their foundation:

The Germanico-Hungarian College, 1552.

The Greek College, 1577.
The Venerable English College, 1579.
The Maronite College, 1584 (re-established 1891).
The Scots College, 1600.
The Irish College, 1626.
The Belgian College, 1844.
The French Seminary, 1853.
The Teutonic College, 1853.
The Lombard Seminary, 1854.
The South American College, 1858.
The North American College, 1859.
The Illyrian College, 1863.
The Polish College, 1866.
The Armenian College, 1883.
The Canadian College, 1887.
The Bohemian College, 1882.
The Spanish College, 1892.
The Ruthenian College, 1897.
The Portugese College, 1900.

THEN AND NOW.

But lo! at the very moment that Catholicity is at its lowest ebb in countries whose kingly and imperial traditions go back into the mist of ages, it suddenly reveals itself in free and republican America as the great religious power in the nation. Just when the ever multiplying sects are crumbling to pieces and their leaders are resorting to all sorts of devices, even to the abandonment of their distinctive dogmas, so as to attract worshipers to the deserted churches, Catholic America is seen, not only instinct with life and vigor, but so powerful and so respected that three of its citizens are clothed at the same time with the scarlet robes of the Church, and the whole nation acclaims with joy the honor that is reflected on itself by the selection. It is a long cry from the disdain and contempt, and even hatred with which Catholicism was regarded in this country not sixty years ago, when Archbishop Bedini, a distinguished representative of the Holy See had to remain in disguise in New York, and later in concealment until he was forced finally to flee for his life, so intense was the hatred of the Sovereign Pontiff, whose message he brought. The world has grown wiser since

then and America recognizes that Catholicity, far from being a menace to the public weal, is the great bulwark of law and order, the fearless defender of the rights of its citizens, and at the same time the undaunted champion and upholder of the country's institutions.—("America," 18 Nov., 1911.)

Work sincerely to promote Christian Unity. God wills it.

Those who have the truth should evidently be somewhat aggressive, not merely defensive.

Besides the sin of deed there is the sin of thought. Thoughts of unbelief are sins.

"The mass of the people was slavish through the days of the Tudors." ("The Dublin Review," October, 1911.) Hence may easily be seen the great influence that Elizabeth had, as her father before her to switch the English people out of their Apostolic line of faith.

Individuals not liking to be restrained by divine authority in matters of faith, considering this irksome should ask themselves: who guides himself in matters of so-called science by his sole investigations; what man makes the constitution under which we all live; what unskilled man, mortally sick, prescribes for himself; what criminal in a death trial is his own advocate?

As Vicar of Christ, as one having charge of His flock all ecclesiastical causes can be referred to the tribunal of the Supreme Pontiff in Rome, and from his decision there is no appeal, not even to the authority of a General Council. We say this in face of the confusion at Constance.

And then again there are Christians who don't value the teachings of the Fathers; regarding them as worthless. Eutyches was a bad man. So the Church declared. When he was tried in 449 by St. Flavian at Constantinople, he refused to accept either the Fathers or Councils as authorities, confining himself to texts of Scripture, conduct which horrified his judges!

Convocation, legislating in religious matters, needs Papal sanction for ecclesiatical effect. To sustain our assertion, let us quote for Englishmen the words of their Father in Christ—Gregory the Great—"Without the sanction of the Apostolic See, no acts of any Synod (Council) can have any force." Epis. 68, lib. 9. All which, of course, applies to other christian sects besides Anglicans.

"Even the greatest erudition does not shield from error," says John Evangelist Zollner. "History teaches that the most learned men have contradicted themselves and continue to contradict themselves in the interpretation of the Bible." And while this is true, we don't find the Church contradicting any of her tenets, notwithstanding the way she has been annoyed by the wicked adown the ages!

Destruction of vested rights—rejection of legitimate authority — falsehood and misrepresentation — political Socialism of today are but the result of religious (?) socialism of yesterday. But the big revolution and confiscation in the Christian world took place nearly 400 years ago. Yes but this period is small, very small in the records of Him with whom 1000 years are as one day. "Jesus Christ, yesterday, today and forever."

We may be blamed perhaps for not including under the name of the Church in these pages the Christians of every sect and creed. We include in the Church the Catholic body for it alone has unity. It is a body with one mind. Catholics are one, for they see spiritual affairs with the eyes and speak through the lips of the Church. Should the sects be included we would have a body with hundreds of conflicting minds? Could any greater monstrosity be imagined?

It was laughable to find men in the first half of the past century, staring at slavery in its enormity and abomination—men and women utterly degraded and auctioned in the mart as horses and yet to find Fourth of July orators declaring "all men are born free and equal." And it is equally laughable to see Englishmen boast today of the Magna Charta and the freedom of the Church in

England when its National Church has verily been the victim of the violation of Magna Charta from the days of the Tudor oppression of Henry and Elizabeth! The erstwhile presecuted Catholic Church has today, deservedly, more freedom there than the National Church has.

"Faith in the teaching of the Church is one solid thing. If one abandon a single article of the faith, he of course abandons it all. St. James says: "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all." And why? Because the sin of breaking some particular law is in disobedience to the law giver. So one abandoning one article of faith ceases to trust in the authority of the Church which presents the faith to him; and his so-called faith in other articles becomes merely his private opinion. His sin is that of distrusting the faith-giver, as that of the other was that of disobeying the lawgiver." (V. Rev. G. M. Searle, C S. P.)

Calvinists formerly so bitter in defending the predestination doctrine of Calvin, are today almost unanimous in rejecting what they themselves call "the boldest defiance ever given to reason and conscience." (Gretillat, "Dogmatique," III, p. 329.)

The Calvinist dogma is today, especially in England, altogether abandoned, and often replaced by pure Pelagianism (Beyschlag). (Vide Cath. Ency., Vol. I, 1-103.) Displacing one heresy by another is a pretty poor way to guide people in the faith which is essential to salvation. No such manipulations in faith matters can be pointed out in the fold of her that is "the pillar and ground of truth."

"Modernism declares that with the new thought Catholicity will die out. But, oh, how often has that been said?" says Msgr Benson, the converted son of an archbishop of Canterbury.

"The great faculty to my mind, in Catholicity lies in its power of recuperation. Once Gnosticism trampled on the ancient faith everywhere; not one man now in a hundred could write five lines on what it was the Gnostics

believed. Nero thought he had killed Christianity when he killed St. Peter; but St. Peter sits on Nero's throne today. Once Elizabeth disemboweled every seminary priest she could lay her hands on, and established Protestantism in Ireland. Now Westminster Cathedral draws immeasurably larger congregations than Westminster Abbey, where Elizabeth lies buried, and Irish Catholicity is an irresistible influence in an English parliament.''

We want our readers, in order to get benefit from these pages, to read reasonably and not prejudicially; as becoming those in quest of the right and true and beautiful and helpful. We ask them to accept the truths of faith as something divinely revealed and handed down on divine authority. Between Reason and Faith, then, revealed by God and transmitted by His authority there can be no conflict. This was proclaimed to the world many years ago by the Vatican Council ''that never can there be a real conflict between Faith and Reason.'' The late Dr. Dwight for four decades Professor of Anatomy at Harvard University, himself a convert when 12 years old, in his admirable work ''Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist'' proves how reasonable are the teachings of religion in his discussion of those points of which scientists are so fond. Oh yes, truly ''Our Faith is a Reasonable Faith.'' (See a treatise under this title by M. Bachur.)

Heresiarchs are arch erratics. We often wondered why Anglicans having State endowments would quote Wycliffe as an authority against the Papacy for ''he maintained that the man, who taught it to be lawful to endow churchmen, was the greatest of heretics and antichrists.'' (Lingard, under date 13th July, 1382.) If he were erratic in denouncing clergymen for getting salaries, might he not be erratic in his other attacks on the Church such as his denial of Transubstantiation. While the Synod condemning his doctrines was in session an earthquake shook London, and while he was assisting at the Mass of his curate about two years afterwards just at the part of the solemn sacrifice when Transubstantiation takes place—at the very moment of the elevation of the Host—a stroke of apoplexy deprived him of the use of his tongue, and of most of his limbs. We are apt to think

that there is a weak vein in the faith of any one, pinning his belief in this pantheist using such an expression as "if there was a God." (Lingard and Alzog, on Wycliffe.)

There was a bitter controversy between St. Stephen, who died A. D. 257, and St. Cyprian who died the following year, both of them martyrs, but Cyprian did not become separated from Stephen. Stephen was right. "The whole discussion," says Cardinal Merry del Val, "come to an end in the time of St. Augustin, and Pope Stephen's reply to St. Cyprian remained as the law of the Universal Church. St. Augustin assures us that 'peace was preserved in all essentials between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, and that the latter did not separate himself from the Pope because he was not 'a son of perdition.' St. Augustin suggests that either the Donatists forged the documents, as they were wont to do, and that St. Cyprian did not say what is attributed to him, or that St. Cyprian, like the other Bishops, corrected his mistake, or again, that his great perseverance in clinging to the unity of the Church covered the blot. 'Moreover,' writes St. Augustin, 'there is this, that, as a most fruitful bough, the Father purged away whatever there was in him to be blotted out, by the sickle of his martyrdom.' (Ep. 93 ad Vincent.) "The Truth of Papal Claims," R. Merry del Val, p. 100.

The revolution in which Luther was the leader was neither an accident nor the work of his own hands. The incident which served as an opportunity for the breaking out of Luther's revolt was the promulgation by Leo X (1517) of a plenary indulgence, the alms attached to the gaining of which were to defray the expenses of a crusade against the Turks and aid in completing the magnificent basilica of St. Peter's at Rome. The Dominican friar Tetzel was appointed to preach the indulgence in Germany. A pretext for Luther's revolt was affording by abuses existing then in the form of dispensing and preaching indulgences; pious bishops had pointed them out and statesmen had protested against them. Tetzel did not altogether avoid the abuses, and later the papal delegate, Miltitz, sharply rebuked him for his indiscretions. When he arrived in

Wittenberg (Oct., 1517), Luther in 95 theses, attacked his views and methods of preaching indulgences. As Luther was a professor of the University of Wittenberg and enjoyed considerable local celebrity, the stand which he took attracted attention. Tetzel entered into a discussion with him. Later, in a public debate with Dr. John Eck, of Leipzig, Luther suffered an ignominious defeat, and was still further humiliated by having the Universities of Paris, Louvain and Cologne, to which the debate was submitted by consent, decide against him. Still he refused to retract his teachings on indulgences.—(Spalding's Church His., p. 506.)

Papacy Needed Daily.

Evidently it won't do for the Supreme Courts to hold session every hundred years, or to wait for an extraordinary Convention of Congress. Every day judgment is called for. Neither will it do to wait for a General Council, for matters affecting faith are constantly arising. And of the nation abides by the ruling of the Supreme Court, so lives the Church abide by the ex-cathedra pronouncements of the Supreme Pontiff. In a series of articles in the "Intermountain Catholic" Denver, the writer considers the proofs afforded us by the Holy Scriptures, by the Councils, by traditions and by the authority of the theologians on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. He next takes up the practice of the Church showing that in Pre-Nicene days the Pontiffs acted as supreme and infallible judges in controversies of faith such as with the Ebionites and Montanists as Pius does today with Modernists. Continuing, he says:

A strong argument for the infallibility of the Pope is found in reason. The good of ecclesiastical unity demands that there be always present in the Church a supreme and infallible judge of controversies; otherwise, since almost daily we see new opinions arising, the faithful would continually remain in doubt and contentions and schisms would perpetually vex the Christian world. But if infallibility did not reside with the Pope, but resided with the councils alone, the great blessing of unity would not have been sufficiently provided for by Christ. On account of inconveniences and expenses and wars, councils could rarely be convened, or at least could not

so quickly be called together as necessity would demand, in order that heresies, which in a short time spread with the greatest rapidity in every direction, might be robbed of their deadly poison with which they would seek to destroy the faith of the flock of Christ. And thus the church would be deprived of a means by which she could preserve unity, and would be deprived of it the greatest part of the time.

"Moreover, it is certain," says St. Alphonsus, "that if the opinion of the Gallican clergy were to be admitted, so that the judgment of the Roman Pontiff would not be infallible until the consent of the Church would be added to it, there would no longer remain a means to convince heretics of their errors, even if general councils were resorted to. The hereties would not acknowledge the council at which they themselves were not present, because their advice not being sought, they would declare every council of no avail, since they would consider themselves the more orthodox part of the Church. It is for this reason that all students will remember how the heterodox were always accustomed, whenever they saw their opinions condemned and proscribed by the Roman Pontiff, in order to escape this condemnation, to immediately appeal their case, trying to take it from the tribunal of the Pope to that of an ecumenical council."

The argument taken from analogy is also a very conclusive one. "Already in the Old Law," says St. Alphonsus, "the word of the high priest was infallible; * * * if, however, such a privilege was given to the synagogue, a fortiori it must be admitted that it was granted to the Church. We know that the Church is scattered throughout the world and is continually attacked by heresies, and therefore she has need of a greater judge than did the synagogue. This judge must be one and infallible, so that he can quickly put an end to errors against faith and morals."

His Facts Wrong.

The ordinary agnostic has got his facts all wrong. He is an unbeliever for a multitude of reasons, but they are untrue reasons. He doubts because the Middle Ages were barbaric, but they weren't; because Darwinism is demonstrated, but it isn't; because Christian art was sad and pale,

but it was decked out in peculiarly bright colors and gay with gold; because modern science is moving away from the supernatural, but it isn't; it is moving towards the supernatural with the rapidity of a railroad train.—Gilbert Chesterton.

A Necessity.

Listen to what the Protestant Guizot in his lectures on European civilization says on the necessity of a government in a religious society; and learn from it the necessity of the Papacy from the days of Pentecost:

"When a religious society has been formed, when a certain number of men are united by a common religious creed, are governed by the same religious precepts, and enjoy the same religious hopes, some form of government is necessary. No society can endure a week, nay more, no society can endure a single hour, without a government. The moment, indeed, a society is formed, by the very fact of its formation, it calls forth a government—a government which shall proclaim the common truth which is the bond of the society, and promulgate and maintain the precepts that this truth ought to produce. The necessity of a superior power, of a form of government, is involved in the fact of a religious, as it is in that of any other society."

"More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of."—Tennyson.

Important Retractation.

The undersigned Schismatical Patriarch recently resigned.

Among the documents that appear in a late issue of the "Acta Apostolicae Sedis" is the following declaration of this Patriarch of the Copts, to the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. It will no doubt prove of interest:

"I, the undersigned, Cyril Macaire, recently resigned Patriarch of the Catholic Copts, having spontaneously come to Rome to attest to the Holy See my firm resolution to live and die in the Catholic faith, under the obedience of the Roman Pontiff, freely and sincerely declare as follows:

"I express deep sorrow for having, in days of temptation, discouragement and profound moral perturbation given public adhesion to the Greek Schismatic Church of Alexandria in Egypt, and I thank God for not having taken part in the religious acts of said Church. I retract all that was done in

this matter. I condemn it and deplore it from my heart. I am ready to accept all the penances and means of reparation which the Holy See may think fit to impose upon me, and to live in future a retired life, dedicating my time to the pious exercises and the studies which are so dear to me. I also retract, condemn and deplore from my heart everything which, during my period of wandering from the right path, I may have said, done or written as a schismatic, and I humbly ask pardon for the scandal given to the faithful by my defection.

"Finally, I renew my solemn promises of obedience to the Holy See and my full and sincere adhesion to the doctrines and directions of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, especially that which concerns the absolute Primacy by divine right of the Roman Pontiff over the Church in general and over every rite and all the faithful in particular. Rome, 9th of March, 1912. Kyrillos Macaire."

The Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople figured greatly in the affairs of the early Church; and when we find the separated Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch now favorable to unity; and when we read the above declaration, is it not encouraging for unity?

Baptists Will Join In World Conference For Church Unity.

Baptists of the Northern Baptist convention will participate in a world conference on faith and order and looking toward a unity of all Protestant churches as called by the Protestant Episcopal church. The report of the commission on the world conference was adopted by the Convention held in Des Moines, Ia., May 24, 1912. The report is in part as follows:

"The Protestant Episcopal Church has invited the various commissions of the Christian church to appoint commissions with a view to holding a world conference on faith and order. Thus far eighteen churches have responded, indicating a symapthy with the purpose of seeking that union of the body of Christian believers for which our Lord Jesus prayed. These commissions have not been called together because the opportune time has not yet come. A purpose as comprehensive as that contemplated must have time to grow in the mind, and its genius become apparent before a conference can hope to work effectively. When the conference is convened, it will be necessary to study in a Christian spirit the points of union in our faith and order and those in which each church

is distinctive. In the meantime each commission is asked to foster a spirit of sympathy with the movement.

"We recommend the annual appointment of a commission from this body that may co-operate with like commissions from other churches and foster a sympathy among us and the entire church of God toward that unity which we believe will ultimately be realized among all who love our Lord in sincerity and truth. Respectfully submitted, E. H. Hanley, W. W. Keen, W. C. P. Rhoades, H. F. Stillwell, C. Woelfkin, chairman."

The One Church.

Is One Church as Good as Another?

This is a senseless question. You might just as well ask me: Is one God as good as another? There is only one Church as there is but one God. "One body and one Spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (Eph. iv. 4-6.) To maintain that all churches or all religions are equally good is to deny religion altogether. Truth and falsehood cannot be placed on the same footing; what is right cannot be wrong at the same time. Truth is one and indivisible and unchangeable. Two and two will always be four; white will always be white. and black always black. Truth is exclusive; it never tolerates its opposite, as light banishes darkness. If I possess the truth, I must hold on to it and shun error. If I believe (as I sincerely do) that the Catholic religion is the true one, I am forced to believe that all other religions or churches are false, and I am obliged to cling to my Church at the risk of heaven. The other churches may teach some true doctrines and accomplish some good, but they remain false, and I can never approve of a falsehood.

We know how the different sects contradict each other: what one accepts the other rejects. Truth does not and cannot contradict itself. There is but one Gospel: "If any one preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 9). There is no room for different theories in religious matters, or for changing the creed or putting another meaning into it according to the wants of the age. "Jesus Christ yesterday and today and the same forever" (Heb. xiii. 8).

Do not accept copper for gold or lead for silver; see that you get the genuine metal. Protestantism is as different from Catholicism as night from day. Be not content with the

counterfeit, but make sure that you have the real coin with the clear ring.

Not every road leads you to Rome, but only the one road which Christ has pointed out.—Bishop Stang.

Be ever thankful to God for the priceless gift of faith, ever grateful to be a member of the Church wherein this faith is preserved inviolate. It is said that Saint Philip Neri, whenever he would recognize a Jew on the streets of Rome, was wont to exclaim: "There but for the grace of God goes Philip Neri."

Reasons Made Public.

Dr. Amieux, of Paris, Tells Why He Became a Catholic.

Dr. Amieux, physician-in-chief of the Menier houses, in a letter to Marc Sagnier has made known to him the principal motives of his conversion as follows:

"My Dear Friend: I am to be a Catholic. I come to ask for your prayers. I can not do without sacraments. You did well to submit to the authority of our Holy Father the Pope. Had you done otherwise, I would not very likely have become a Catholic now, for I had confidence in you, and you would have ruined my confidence, and thus retarded my conversion. I have waited four years before taking this irrevocable decision, on which I never will go back in spite of the disappointments which may await me in the Catholic religion.

"I have studied the doctrine point by point. I have prayed to God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, and I have also implored the aid of the Blessed Virgin. After an incessant labor, and an effort of religious experimentation, which God alone knows . . . in the full possession of my faculties, with the sentiment of all my responsibilities, I want to be a Catholic.

"With all the power that is in me, I believe in the Revelation, in the Trinity, in the Incarnation, in Grace, in the sovereign and infallible authority of the Pope in matters of faith. I believe in the real presence of Jesus Christ—born of the Virgin Mary, and risen on the third day—in the Sacred Host, and in the efficacy of all the Catholic sacraments.

"As the philosophy of Sabatier or Harnack, or the variations of Protestantism do not satisfy my deep religious needs, it is a duty for me to proclaim my definite faith, and to glorify God for my ascension toward, and my possession of the Light, the absolute Truth.

"Protestantism may give a perfume of Jesus Christ, but it hides his actual reality and that is why I am going to the Catholic faith."

Right Rev. Mgr. Robert Hugh Benson in a recent lecture in New York City, answered the question: "What is Catholicism?" in the following manner: "It is that faith that has all the chief beliefs of all other religions. It is that religion that has been many times pronounced as dead—by Luther three centuries ago and others before him. It is that faith that after being declared dead, has been entombed, so to speak, and a heavy stone rolled up to the entrance and a contingent of guards stationed on the outside to watch, fearing that its disciples might come and open the way. It is that faith that, although all these things have been done, time and time again, has always risen and stands to-day as the largest institution in the world."

Would that the helps and hints in the foregoing pages, calculated to guide the prayerful reader to the true Church, enable him to exclaim in gratitude with the illustrious Newman:

"Grant, O my God, that every moment I live may be with Thee; and every breath I breathe, may be a desire to speak with Thee; and so, by thy Grace, may I learn for the rest of my life to suffer in loving Thee, for all the suffering I have caused Thee, in the rejection of thy Love when sinning against Thee.

"O long sought after, tardily found, the Desire of the eye, the Joy of the heart, the Truth after many shadows, the Fulness after many foretastes, the Home after many storms. Come to her, poor children, for she it is, and she alone, who can unfold to you the secret of your being and the meaning of your destiny." (Cardinal Newman: "Sermons to Mixed Congregations.")

Separated brethren, the Catholic religion—the Catholic Church, is for you: is yours. Its divine doctrine, its salutary sacraments, its Almighty arrangements, and its Book of Books—the Bible, are for you as well as for others. Don't be satisfied with a part, come enjoy the whole. Let no person nor any worldly interest prevent you from obtaining these benefits in their fulness. Strange, (and as a result of ancestral

folly or prejudice) that you regard the Church as solely for the benefit of others, exclusive of you. We entreat you not to further disinherit yourselves; we invite you to come share in the Church's blessings so as to obtain its everlasting rewards. Come and avail yourselves of God's Church. It is God's voice to you. It is His speaking, teaching Self.

"The Catholic Church held (before the reformation and still holds today) doctrines regarded by the Church of England as idolatrous," says Lloyd George. Why, therefore, maintain that the Anglican is a continuation of the pre-reformation Catholic Church? Why?

This imputation of idolatry shows such ignorance and malice that its refutation is seldom made by Catholics. An eminent Protestant (Dr. Schaff) says, "To say the Papists are idolaters is a colossal slander on the oldest and largest Church in Christendom, and is untrue, unjust, uncharitable and unchristian."

("Creed Revision," pp. 34–39.)

A Colony Without Papists.

The country from "100 miles west of Pennsylvania, to 100 miles west of the Mississippi," is a well filled Catholic region to-day. Below is a report of a project to effect a settlement from which Catholics should be excluded. The account is taken from The Remembrancer; or Impartial Repository of Public Events, Part III, for the year 1776. London, J. Almon. Page 131, etc.

"Scheme for the settlement of a new colony to the westward of Pennsylvania, for the enlargement of his Majesty's dominions in America, for the further promotion of the Christian religion among the Indian natives and the more effective securing them in his Majesty's alliance."

Projected by Sam. Hazard, who in a letter dated July 14, 1756, to Hon. Thos. Pownal, said: "I have now between 4,000 and 5,000 persons able to bear arms engaged to go and settle in the proposed colony, if the scheme goes on, and can easily procure more than double that number; among those already engaged are 15 ministers."

The colony was to begin 100 miles west of Pennsylvania to 100 miles west of the Mississippi—Land was to be given to all over 14 years—at least 12 ministers were to go—"No member of the Church of Rome" shall be able to hold any lands or real estate in the Province nor be allowed to be owners

of, or have any arms or ammunition in their possession on any pretence whatsoever, nor shall any Mass house or Popish Chapels be allowed in the province."—American Catholic Historical Researches.

This exempted territory, exempted as being the garden spot of the United States, is where the Church—the Church of the Papists—flourishes to-day as the Rose of Jericho. Within its boundaries are fourteen Dioceses with millions of Catholics, having Cathedrals and splendid Churches; universities, colleges and academies; while it is studded over with Parochial Schools where Catholic youth—the hope and pride of the nation—are receiving their education.

The above proscribed colony is now flanked on its western line by two new and flourishing Dioceses; while within its western limits are the large and important Sees of Dubuque and Davenport. A few miles west of its line of demarkation is **Grand Junction,** where is issued this Appeal for Unity, imploring the Christian hosts to unite as an irresistible phalanx to conquer the world for the Redeemer.

Fifty miles south of Grand Junction and towards the southwestern course of demarkation lies the capital of Iowa—Des Moines—with 5 magnificent Churches with their schools, academy and hospital. Des Moines is now a See City with Rt. Rev. A. Dowling, its first Bishop, and the Rt. Rev. M. Flavin, V. G. The Bishop enjoys a $100,000 palatial residence as the gift of the noble Polk family.

Fifty miles north is Fort Dodge with its splendid churches and schools, and other religious institutions. Here resides Rt. Rev. Jas. Saunders, V. G., of the new diocese of Sioux City; (Rt. Rev. P. J. Garrigan being its first bishop,) and which has made great advancement in the past ten years, its first decade. Some miles further north and towards the northwestern corner of the proscribed territory is Mason City, a flourishing Catholic center and where the Most Rev. Archbishop Keane, Dubuque, purchased the Memorial University, February, 1912, for benevolent and Catholic purposes. And while active and devoted pastors within the line of demarkation and adjacent to it have difficulty in providing accommodation for the increasing faithful, the Rev. Adams, Presbyterian clergyman, reports fifty-seven deserted Protestant churches in one State alone of this territory in the year 1911. (This is Illinois). We mention the above facts in illustration of what was said of old: "There is no wisdom, there is no prudence, there is no council against the Lord."—**Prov. 21: 30.**

The Preachers Cry: "Erravimus, Stulte Egimus."

(In the preceding pages we pointed out the arrangement of our Divine Saviour for the world, so that mankind may know with a certainty what He has taught and revealed and bequeathed for their salvation. In plain words we pointed out the folly and sin of any Christian opposing His arrangements. Possibly our separated brethren may find fault with something we said. But their criticism will be softened and their anger mitigated in learning that some of their own brethren acknowledge the mistakes of the reformation. When Protestants themselves admit the evils of their system why should any one censure us for helpfully and conscientiously pointing out its wrongs. We quote from this article as it appeared in the Catholic Press, suppressing its most severe, most injurious and condemnatory sentences.)

We have had in this city for a whole week a "Religious Education Convention," the members being exclusively preachers engaged in the work of education. They have been doing little beyond making public confession of their sins for the past four hundred years. They say they have made a botch of their "Evangelical Church." It never was a church, to begin with, and now it is absolutely and universally discredited.

* * *

They have no divine message for the people; and the world has found them out. They should turn their attention to some honest calling; preferably the pedagogical or medical, but any save that of ministers of Christ. This is very plain talking, and it took a long time and a good deal of courage, supported by public opinion, to make the avowal. To sum up their general confession, they say their work is a botch; they, themselves are bunglers; and, finally, their tools are useless and antiquated.

This confession has been made and repeated by all the members of the convention, from Chairman Kirkland down to the least in the body. They explain their utter rout in language that must disgust the few Protestants who have a lingering regard for their religion. One preacher says the fear of God is no more in the hearts of the people. In the beginning they were told "to flee from the wrath to come," and they

fied for protection to the churches and cowered under the pulpits. The cry is heard no more. There is no need of alarm. There is no Hell for any but the vulgar, and God knows no difference between the sinner and the saint, unless it be that he lean a little towards the former. Religion is comprised in three words: Respectability, politeness and culture. * * *

Then the Bible is a bad book. It should not be read by everybody. It should never be read in the home. Its unrestricted reading begets fools and fanatics, and ignorant evangelists. It requires some knowledge to read the Bible intelligently; and some submission of heart and mind to read it profitably. It should be kept out of the hands of the multitude.

This is very radical talk and the preachers of the old school are crying out against the blasphemers. But there is no help for it.

* * *

What a hecatomb of souls these preachers have offered up to the savage God of hate. What mountains of lies they have raised, what valleys of sin they have emptied, what clouds of darkness they have sent forth upon the earth! They have been against Christ's Church and Christ's Gospel and Christ himself; * * * * * * *

What the Convention of Religious Educators admits today the Church declared four hundred years ago. When Luther and his followers put the Bible in the place of the Church the Pope said, it will be a witness against you and prove your undoing. The Church said, I am the mouthpiece of the Word of God and the sole interpreter of the Bible. Accept the Bible, for it contains the word of God, but listen while I teach from its meaning. The Bible must be read with reverence and under the guidance of a divinely appointed teacher. "Private Judgment" and "private interpretation of the Scriptures" are the banners of Lucifer, and his hosts are marshalled under it. The Church told the self-commissioned preachers of the sixteenth and succeeding centuries that they were without a mission, and were deceiving the world. She spoke out loud enough to be heard to the ends of the earth; but it took the stupid world four hundred years to understand what

she said. And their disillusion comes from their own teachers and guides: From one end of the earth to the other the discredited teachers of the Reformation cry out "Erravimus: stulte egimus." We have blundered and made fools of ourselves.—"Western Watchman," St. Louis, March 21, 1912.

Benefits.

For sundry persons let us state that "What Stubbs reported, that 'papal law was not binding in England, even in questions of faith and morals unless it had been accepted by the national authorities' is shown by the distinguished jurist, F. W. Maitland, to be untrue. Professor Maitland, with an irrefragable array of illustrations drawn mainly from the classical canon-law book of the English pre-Reformation Church, the 'Provinciale' of Bishop Lyndwood (1435), maintains the exact contrary. According to Lyndwood 'The Pope is above the law. . . . to dispute the authority of a papal decretal is to be guilty of heresy,' at a time when deliberate heresy was a capital crime." (Cath. Ency., England, Vol. 5, p. 439.)

For the benefit of those asserting that the kings of England were hostile to the Church; that the Church in England was not Roman in pre-Reformation days, let us remind them of some conclusive words in Rt. Rev. John S Vaughan's publication, "The Purpose of the Papacy". King Edward III (who wielded the sceptre gloriously and strenuously for 50 years A. D. 1327-1377), having received some reprimand from Pope Benedict XII, wrote to him thus: "That the kings of England, our predecessors, those illustrious champions of Christ, those defenders of the Faith, those **zealous asserters of the rights of the Holy Roman Church, and devout observers of her commands** that they or we shall deserve this unkindness, we neither know nor believe. . . . We constantly avow that we are and shall continue to be, to your Holiness and to your seat, a devout and humble son, and not a step-son."

Benedict XII begins his reply by expressing his satisfaction that "his most dear son in Christ, King Edward of England," should thus "follow the commenda-

ble footsteps of his progenitors, kings of England, who were famous for the fullness of their devotion and faith towards God and the Holy Roman Church.'' (Pp. 151-155.)

And for the benefit of those who prize the opinion of a king of England on spiritual matters let us say that he asserts that the rejection of the Pope is heresy. King Edward's words are ''Your Holiness presides over every creature, **which to deny is heresy**''. (P. 153.)

For the benefit of High Church folk claiming Apostolic Succession we state that the pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England condemned Wycliffe. So, of course, would the Anglican Church if it were the post-Reformation Catholic Church, that is, if they were in succession. But the Anglican Church praises Wycliffe. Murder will out.

For the benefit of those who say they have authority to teach independent of the Church—the Ecclesia docens—the Apostolic band—let us remark that there is no record in the Scripture that the other disciples, or followers got a separate, or independent authority. Nay more; we don't find these present when the wonderful charter was conferred on the Ecclesia (the Church). We find it distinctly stated that the **eleven** were present.—St. Matt. 28:16; St. Mark 16:14.

For the benefit of those having a superficial knowledge of the sacred writings and no mission to teach, yet contradict the Church—the authorized teacher—the one assisted by the Holy Spirit—let us remark that when our Saviour appeared to the disciples after the Resurrection, and reminded them of the word He had spoken to them while He was yet with them, that He found it necessary to open their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures; and that He commanded them, (replete with heavenly doctrine though they were,) to stay in the city (and not attempt to teach) till they should be endued with power from on high (Luke 24:44-49) at Pentecost. And, if our Saviour thus acted in this formal, instructive and impressive way, let us ask why should ignorant, presumptuous, unauthorized persons dare teach their own opinions and especially against Christ's own representative?

The Jesuit Oath.

For the benefit of our separated brethren, we print the following "terrible Jesuit oath," or rather the vow, taken by each Jesuit on becoming a member of the society:

"Almighty Everlasting God, I — N — although altogether unworthy of thy Divine sight, yet trusting in Thy infinite mercy, and impelled by the desire of serving Thee, in presence of the most holy Virgin Mary and all the Court of Heaven, do vow to Thy Divine Majesty perpetual Poverty, Chastity and Obedience in the Society of Jesus; and I promise that I will enter the said Society forever to lead my life therein—understanding all things according to the Constitution of the same Society. Therefore, I suppliantly beg of Thy infinite goodness and mercy by the Blood of Jesus Christ, to accept this holocaust in the odor of sweetness, and that as Thou hast given me grace to desire and make this offering, so Thou wilt bestow on me plentiful grace to fulfil it. Amen."

"America," Vol. VII, No. 6.

Press Notices and Comments on the Appeal for Unity in the Faith

Donohue & Co. have just brought out a new and important publication, very timely in this era of realization on the part of so many thousands outside the Catholic fold, of the deplorable consequences of the division of professed believers in Christianity into discordant sects. This publication is entitled "An Appeal for Unity in Faith," being an appeal to Anglican (Protestant Episcopalians) and Protestants of other denominations to return to the unity of the faith. The author is Rev. John Phelan of Grand Junction, Iowa, whose former work, "Gems and Pearls," received such general approbation. The new work is a handsome volume, bearing the Imprimatur of the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Sioux City, Iowa, and Censor Deputatus, Rt. Rev. F. X. Feuerstein.

In the exordium to the book, Father Phelan calls attention to the recent endeavors of non-Catholic church conventions, to create a working basis for a union of all professing Christians; also to the need of such a union

in face of the growing evils of our day. He exhorts all to work and pray that the present time may be signalized by the progress of this oneness of faith.

In twenty chapters Father Phelan presents powerful arguments, covering the only possible basis for Christian unity. He cites Scriptures, the voices of the fathers of the Church and the testimony of history in general to the fact that the Papacy is the evangelical guardian of Christian unity, and that only within the fold of Peter is there security for the great truths of Christian revelation from the interference of secular rulers and the corruption of disbelief.

Father Phelan's splendid volume is one that every Catholic priest and layman should possess. It is a veritable mine of information on church history and secular history as far as it is connected with church matters. On every page we find data of the most useful and enlightening character. It presents much in condensed form that if amplified, would swell it into half a dozen volumes. It presents such a multiplicity of facts that it is difficult to conceive of any possible phase of the great question that is not admirably developed.

"The Messenger" congratulates Father Phelan on his powerful presentation of the case for Church Unity and predicts for it a widespread recognition among the clergy and laity of the state and nation. May his splendid book prove a factor towards the fulfillment of Our Divine Lord's ideal of "one fold and one shepherd" upon earth. —Catholic Messenger, Davenport, Iowa.

As a consequence of this divine presence of Christ in His Church "The gates of hell shall never prevail against her," and therefore she can never go astray, therefore she can never teach error or false doctrine, therefore she must always and everywhere teach just what Christ Himself would teach were He here bodily present going from city to city, from country to country, teaching the truths of Salvation for she is simply, as it were, a continuation of Christ's Incarnate life here upon earth till the crack of doom. During Holy week we followed our Blessed Lord through Jerusalem up the rugged heights of Calvary and watched with horrified eyes the brutal soldiers tearing His Sacred Body into shreds. Oh, God, the very

thought is sickening. Yes, but remember that S. Paul calls the Church "The Body of Christ." Look at this Body of Christ today. See how it is torn asunder by the so-called followers of the Crucified One. Compare Christ's mystic body, the Church, with His mangled, bleeding body on Calvary. This awful crime was committed in the 16th century and has been going on ever since. How much longer will this unfortunate work go on? What about Christ's prayer for unity? Will we not co-operate with Christ that His prayer may be realized here and now?

We have just received and read **a very able, timely and remarkable book** called "Appeal for Unity in the Faith." It is intended for Catholics and Protestants; for the former that they may remain in "the One Fold of Christ"; for the latter that they may enter "the One Fold Under the One Shepherd." Christians, are you anxious to do good work? Do you want to promote Christ's wish for unity? If so, get this great work, read it and then give it to your Protestant friends to read. You cannot do anything more pleasing to the heart of Christ. * * * If the good and truth loving people of England and America, Catholic and non-Catholic, will read Father Phelan's "Appeal for Unity," in a prayerful manner we are convinced that Christ's pleading prayer will result in "One Fold Under One Shepherd." * * * Oh, Loving Savior make Thy prayer efficacious! Heal the wounds of Thy Church. Bless all who help in this glorious work.—The Western Catholic, Quincy, Illinois.

By the courtesy of the author, we have received a copy of "Appeal for Unity in the Faith," a handsome volume in octavo of over three hundred pages of simple, solid reasoning. **The book throws a flood of light on the problems that perplex the present-day religious world,** and offers in a clear, convincing manner, without any attempt at literary flourish, the Catholic solution. To priests and educated laymen, and more particularly students in our ecclesiatical seminaries, it ought prove an invaluable aid. The various phases of Protestant controversy are handled in an able yet courteous manner, not so much in the spirit of controversy as of conciliation, and the intelligent, open-minded Protestant is invited to examine

know the grounds of his faith and reconsider his position in the Christian world.—Intermountain Catholic, Denver, Colorado.

The Sunday Times: Here is a book for both Catholics and Protestants. . . .

The Springfield Tribune: The book is dedicated to all lovers of truth.

Western World: Handsome volume. . . . Father Phelan's works should be read by every Catholic.

The Catholic Tribune, (St. Joseph, Mo.): We feel that this book will assist very much in making converts. . .

The Catholic Opinion: A most excellent book for both Catholic and non-Catholic readers and deserves a wide circulation.

The Catholic News: How much the author has at heart the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for Unity at the Last Supper is evidenced in every line of this book.

The Catholic Advance: Father Phelan's book is signalized by great earnestness, clearness of expression and fulness of treatment.

The Pittsburg Observer: . . . The author urges Protestants to come back to the Church of their forefathers. His book is a strong argument for the reunion of Christendom. . . .

The Michigan Catholic: . . . One of the most needful and interesting of recent publications. The Catholic press can do no better than to urge the wide circulation of this excellent book.

The Catholic Messenger (Worcester): . . . The valiant and reverend author is devoting much effort to the dissemination of the idea of a reunion once more of all Christendom under the Pope of Rome.

The True Voice: Father Phelan is not unknown to the reading public. He has already published in two volumes: "Catholic Gems and Pearls," which attained wide popularity. Years ago he ably edited "The Northwestern Catholic" of Sioux City.

The Church Progress: . . . No important fact, or incident is overlooked, which makes his work the most exhaustive on the question of unity. . . . The book is extremely satisfying, is a striking contribution to a burning topic of the day and should have a generous reading clientage.

The Toledo Blade. . . . It is strongly recommended by the reverend clergy and the Catholic press. Book is one that should be read by all Christians interested in this great question. It is written in a spirit of courtesy, conciliation and charity and contains nothing that can offend the sensibilities of fair-minded non-Catholics.

The Western Watchman: The Rev. John Phelan has given us a book of true and powerful purpose in "An Appeal for Unity in the Faith." . . . We believe that the earnest piety of religious fervor in the one motive in the book, Unity, would have a rejuvenating influence on all readers of whatever religious bias, and if our Protestant friends could or would peruse the volume, the desired end would be half accomplished.

The Catholic Chronicle. . . . Rev. J. Phelan makes one of the strongest appeals that has ever been published for "that consummation devoutly to be wished," the reunion of Christendom. He makes a clear and logical case for the One True Church. And he writes in a tone so filled with the true love of God, yet so tempered with the wisdom and reasonableness of that love, that his book is

indeed an appeal, one that must give many a heart pause, one that surely will win souls to the truth.

The Monitor (San Francisco): The earnest and capable writer has put his whole heart into a plea that rarely falls short of inspiration and is, as the author says in the preface,—"An appeal addressed to people too intellectual to be infidels." To the noble Knights of Columbus an especial call is made for their aid in the cause of reunion as discussed in "An Appeal for Unity in the Faith."

Catholic Tribune: . . . In view of such demoralizing and confusing tendencies, as also in the face of the ever increasing necessity for a united stand of all Christian forces to oppose the de-Christianizing influence of the stage and the press, books, like that written by Rev. J. Phelan of Grand Junction, Iowa, become an urgent need of the hour. The demand for unity felt by our Protestant brethren must be directed into the right channels. The Catholic position must be clearly stated. This book answers this purpose.

The New World: . . . Book shows a great deal of research in a field which the author has evidently made his own. . . . It is a powerful and logical marshalling of facts to show the necessity of non-Catholics seeking shelter in the sanctuary of the true faith. It is also a powerful appeal to the non-Catholic world to return to that faith once preached to the saints. . . . It is wanting in nothing that goes to make the publication of a book all that it should be.

The Catholic Columbian: . . . It should meet with a hearty response from all engaged in missionary work for the Church. False charges are refuted, schisms explained and logical convincing argument used so that Catholics will all the more appreciate the solid principles that underlie their belief. . . . For his appeal we bespeak the generous patronage of our readers. One of these books placed in the hands of a non-Catholic friend will surely sow some seed from which results may be expected.

The Catholic Citizen: A book with a purpose. . . . It is replete with the latest notes of the long-cherished desire that the "separated brethren" of many sects (and particularly the Anglicans), shall reunite themselves to "the Mother Church of Christendom." The tone of the book is kindly; its argument is scriptural, fraternal and historical. It cannot help doing good for the cause advocated; and it also must prove strengthening to the loyalty of Catholics. . . . The treatment of points in separate short chapters is especially convenient.

The Tidings: . . . Of special interest at this particular time is this able work by Rev. John Phelan. . . . He deals with the subject without harshness, yet adduces arguments so clear and convincing that no unprejudiced mind can fail to grasp this truth. It is to be hoped that this work will find its way into the hands of non-Catholics of all denominations. Father Phelan deserves the support and encouragement of all Catholics for so able a treatise on this subject that just now seems uppermost in the Christian mind, for he has done much towards "restoring all things in Christ."

The Sacred Heart Review: . . . Catholics believe and know that the true Church of God can never lose that distinguishing mark of Unity which belongs essentially and unfailingly to her, just the same as Holiness, Catholicity and Apostolicity are essentially her distinguishing and unfailing signs. We pray that non-Catholics may be enlightened to perceive and embrace these fundamental truths. And, in his Appeal, Father Phelan quotes certain facts that indicate an awakening in the Protestant mind to these salient ideas. . . . We recommend this book to the careful and prayerful attention of our readers.

The Catholic Light: . . . Is one of the most unique books in the language. . . . Although the Epistles of the Beloved Disciple are effusions of charity yet he had an abhorrence of the heresy of Cerinthus, as did that same Disciple's own follower—St. Polycarp—have of that of Marcion; so a fraternal spirit pervades the "Appeal" while the author expresses his horror of

error. This book ought to be in the hands of the Catholic laity—learned and unlearned. It will help to enlighten the former and will help to educate the latter. Nay, more, it is bound to be a great assistance to non-Catholics. Once they become impressed with the fact that there is, in their midst, a Divinely-delegated Teacher, then believing in all her teaching is only a matter of course. Let the book have a wide circulation. Its price is only one dollar. Its pages are over 300.

The Chicago Citizen: It is a book for every man of ordinary intelligence. . . . The reverend author inexorably, yet gently, destroys the delusive theory that the Church of England, as by law established, is, with its offspring in America, a branch of the Catholic Church. . . . He has compressed into his book a most interesting fund of information on the main subject of his work and on kindred and incidental questions. It is full of interest and information from cover to cover and admirably adapted for the purpose for which it was written. As a compendium of texts, quotations and citings from authorities, it will be a valuable help to clergymen, enabling them to have at hand the essence of the arguments contained in their larger and less handy volumes. To the Catholic it will be a bracer and a tonic, refreshing the memory of historical facts almost forgotten since one's school days, in the absorbing pursuits of life. To the non-Catholic it will open up a mine of truth and fact, and in many cases may direct his steps backward to the old Church of his fathers. We commend this excellent work to everybody. Its price will be a dollar returning its hundredfold in interest and knowledge.

The Catholic Standard and Times: A trumpet call for unity. . . . It has long been a cause of curious wonder how it came about that England, which had been for many centuries the strong citadel and bulwark of the faith, allowed herself to be so easily and completely cozened out of it by a handful of daring schemers and plunderers as she was in the short interval between the period of Henry's demise and his bad daughter's accession; and those who stand bewildered over the mystery will find much relief in the pages of Father Phelan's

thesaurus—for such indeed his carefully prepared book is—of marshaled facts making a complete structural proof. If Unitarians can attract hearers by a call for unity in a faith that repudiates the Divinity of Christ, what cannot Catholics hope for by a logical argument for reunion in Him whose last prayer was for Unity, as against Division with freedom for difference! Every point of objection that can be raised against a return to the state of Oneness in faith and its symbols, in Headship and Confession, is here anticipated and clinchingly answered. We believe that the circulation of such a book must be a powerful lever in the success of the enterprise that is now launched, and so we welcome it as an invaluable auxiliary.

The Columbiad: . . The author's zeal is commendable, and he deserves the hearty co-operation of every right minded Christian. He makes a special appeal to his brother Knights. . . . Splendid book. . . .

The Apostolate: . . . We read of congresses and conventions pledging themselves to procure Christian unity, and to the appeals for unity of enthusiasts at such times, we imagine we hear the sharp reply of busy, practical matter-of-fact men: "Get together among yourselves first." Or as one editor expressed it: "These sects are centers of division rather than of union." There are so many seeming centers of unity and so many frantic appeals to unity that the average man begins to regard them as mockery, and to ask: "Unity with what? with whom?" A New York paper said some time ago: "In the midst of this hubbub of religious controversy America goes from one man to another asking for the truth."

The trouble with most of these appeals to unity is either, there is nothing discernible with which to unite, or, there is no feasible method by which to effect a union, or the appeal itself is not inviting. If, lost in the weeds of the wood, you cry at dusk to the wayfarer, or the precession to unite with you, your appeal is likely to go unheeded.

The one who appeals for Christian unity must be himself secure, visibly seated on a solid rock, easy of access; his tones must ring true, and be couched in a kindly,

winning way. They must be inviting, and must promise security. The wayfarer wishes to waste no time in taking chances. He wants to get somewhere to safety. He won't be dragged, he must be won. The one who gives him the reason, shows him the way to safety, home and Heaven, in a kindly Christ-like way, wins his confidence, and he goes to him willingly.

This is the picture of Father John Phelan, of Grand Junction, Iowa, in the book under review. In the midst of so many appeals from unity one welcomes this appeal to unity. It is born in due time, and will do an apostles work. It is conceived in the proper spirit, and can offend no unprejudiced person. By it many will look on Holy Church as Disraeli in Florence did on Venus: "I gazed upon the Venus de Medici without prejudice and left it with veneration.

There have been many and varied "appeals" by Catholics, but most of them are forgotten. An appeal to unity to mean anything must come from the Catholic Church. She only has been on the ground from the beginning. She alone has the basis of unity, she alone that something to which men will unite themselves, that something they can stay by. But they must be told that, and in a winning way. This is what Father Phelan has done in his book.

He dedicates his book to Catholics, (to inform them and to justify the appeal)and to Protestants—particularly to Anglicans, to whom he speaks practically throughout the volume. In the first chapter he shows the necessity of Christian unity, especially here in America, where we are civilly, e pluribus unum. Then searching for a basis of unity he goes step by step, by as many chapters, back beyond the year 500 A. D. to the day of the verbal Gospel message. From this he draws his creed, perfectly in harmony with the doctrine always taught by the Church, and acceptable to all calling themselves Christians. Then he constructs the Church as it stands in history, founded by Christ, one, Holy, Apostolic, Catholic, centered in Rome about the chair of Peter and his successors. The living Church is always the living basis of unity. Separation from it is schism and the worst sin, to prove which the sayings of the Fathers are copiously employed. He shows that England once believed in the Papacy, has not done so since the time of Elizabeth and consequently is in

schism and sin, and not of true unity and concludes with "Let us get together." It is a genuine appeal. No better title could be given to the book. The words leap like prayers from the heart of the good priest of God aching to bring all the knowledge of the truth.

The name, Ecclesia Elizabethana, is new to me, and not any the better liked on that account. It can hardly be a slip of the pen, for it appears altogether too frequently. There is plenty of matter, lots of information for most readers not too fastidious, any amount of Scripture texts and citations. . . . The book is very attractively bound, good paper, good type and good proof. It will make an acceptable gift to any Catholic, good, bad or middling, a convert, a nearly-Catholic, a non-Catholic, and I wish it were in the hands of many prejudiced or bigoted non-Catholics. It would do all good, and many would not fail to yield to the "Appeal."

Also from the "Denver Catholic," the "Catholic Register" and others, come hearty words of recommendation.

Amongst the non-Catholic notices is this one from the "American Catholic" (Protestant Episcopal): When Father Phelan battles mightily for a visible Church, we can agree; but when all this is added to the weight of his opinions in order to carry through the conviction of a primitive papacy, we must cry halt to such a method. A protestant might be swept along by the very number of quotations and pages of argument.

Also Rev. Dr. Sarchet, Jefferson, Ia., writes: As a Presbyterian in entire harmony and thorough accord with my own church, I do not endorse all the ideas advocated in this book. Nevertheless I admire the evident sincerity of purpose, forceful diction and strong literary style evidenced by the work. * * The chief glory of the Episcopal Church is to be as much like the Catholic Church as possible and yet stand out as dissenter. Considering their origin and history your appeal to them to return to the mother fold has great force. * * With your faith in a united Christendom, however, you cannot go wrong in your work, for you will always be trying to rally men to the standard of Zion, and many who hear your voice will harken to the call.

CONTENTS

A.

Action, Catholic, 317.
Africa, 126.
After the "three days separation," action now, 13.
Agatha St , 44.
Agnostic, 171, 174.
Aid of the Catholic Church, 502
Aidan St , 124.
Alexandria, 141, 218, 237, 241, 242, 276.
Alfred the Great, 118.
Altar, 61, 133.
Alzog, 226, 246, 260.
Ambrose St , 58, 63, 220, 226.
American, 19, 180.
American decisions, 133, 168.
Americans, 55, 65, 73, 77, 87, 103, 105, 106, 111, 120, 133, 136, 139, 145, 146, 148, 151, 154, 157, 162, 164, 165, 167, 177, 179, 186, 187, 188, 190, 196, 201, 204, 302, 236, 244, 245, 249, 257, 272, 282, 286.
American Archbishop on Modernism, 315.
Americans find, 236.
Americans look to England to rectify evils, 19.
Americans see, 196, 257, 275.
Anglican and Anglicans, 14, 32, 44, 60, 66, 67, 68, 70, 77, 100, 102, 120, 134, 135, 138, 148, 153, 162, 163, 166, 167, 168, 178, 186, 195, 197, 203, 204, 206, 216, 222, 230, 237, 249, 254, 257, 260, 265, 278, 288.
Anglicans defeated, 77.
Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Saxons, 25, 33, 84, 96, 115, 160, 164, 167, 178, 186, 193, 197, 198, 257, 260, 281.
Anselm St , 118, 124, 158.
Answers self-evident, 71.
Ante-Nicene, 280.
Anti-Christ, 60.
Antioch, 60, 91, 241, 242, 243, 276.
Apostles, 36, 45, 53, 63, 87, 115, 152, 160, 168, 172, 186, 191, 201, 237, 257, 264, 278.
Apostolicity, 46, 48.

Appeal of St. Athanasius, 62.
Are you a Christian? 267.
Arians, 44, 63, 90, 215, 267, 275.
Arius, 141.
Arles, 25, 96, 247.
Arnold on Catholicism, 304.
Articles, the Thirty-nine, 22, 53, 140, 143, 148, 160, 162, 166, 172, 190, 197, 210, 214, 223, 230, 236, 271, 288.
Articles, the Five, 99, 253.
Arundell Primate, 99, 104.
Ashton, Rev. J , 188.
Asia, 105, 126, 150.
Athanasius St., 58, 61, 62, 89, 90, 92, 184, 215, 247.
Athelstan, 115.
Atonement, 16.
Augustin St , 33, 58, 65, 91, 144, 167, 171, 220, 221, 222, 231, 237, 246, 262.
Augustine St., 33, 55, 85, 96, 115, 164, 178, 179, 180, 218, 222, 228, 248, 257, 260.
Australia, 162.
Authority of the reformers, 211.

B.

Ballinger, 255.
Baptists will join Unity Conference, 337.
Basil, St., of Ancyra, 92.
Basil, St., of Caesaria, 92.
Basis of Reunion, 22.
Bede, Ven. (St.), 89, 94, 167, 168, 178, 218, 237.
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 41.
Benefits, 345.
Benson, Rt. Rev. R. H., 9, 281.
Berengarius, 177, 226, 287.
Bible, 29, 56, 60, 68, 69, 71, 112, 123, 147, 184, 188, 191, 200, 206, 207, 211, 229, 232, 258, 262, 268, 288.
Bishop, the first in Christendom, 237.
Blessed Mary's land, 13.
Body Mystical, 29, 31, 107.
Boleyn, Anne, 101, 136, 188.
Boniface, St., 115, 257.
Booth, General, 12.
Bossuet, 244.
Bourne, Cardinal, 179, 253, 257.
Briggs, Dr. Charles Augustus, 8.

Britain, 53, 57, 94, 96, 123, 134, 178, 188, 193
Britannia formerly Our Lady's Dowry, 13.
British, 248.
Brougham, Lord, 240.
Brownson, Orestes A., 240, 257, 284
Burnett, 230.

C.

Cabot, 180.
Calvin, 35, 160, 238, 262, 263, 272.
Calvinists, 61.
Cambridge, 241.
Canada, 20, 66.
Canon 28th of Chalcedon, 86.
Canterbury, 9, 65, 66, 98, 99, 113, 128, 141, 143, 177, 180, 210, 215, 216, 218, 237, 254, 273, 281.
Catherine, Queen, 136, 278.
Carthusians, 102, 138.
Catholic, 23, 26, 32, 35, 64, 99, 112, 122, 124, 134, 144, 145, 151, 152, 153, 160, 161, 174, 178, 179, 188, 195, 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 210, 236, 275.
Catholic Poem by a Protestant, 13.
Cecil, the Plotter, 101.
Celestine, St., 240, 244, 246.
Chair of Peter, 59, 60.
Charlemagne, 261.
Chateaubriand, 171.
Chelsea, Council of, 97.
Chillingworth, 284.
China, 33, 105, 114, 115, 164, 179, 184, 267, 269, 270.
Choice of a Church with the Fathers, 91.
Christianity will be strengthened, 302.
Christians ought to be enthused, 12.
Chrysostom, St. John, 32, 58, 225.
Church, 10, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 48, 53, 54, 64, 65, 67, 72, 73, 76, 96, 108, 117, 121, 122, 124, 126, 133, 134, 136, 143, 144, 145, 148, 149, 151, 154, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 167, 171, 173, 174, 178, 179, 184, 188, 191, 193, 195, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 206, 208, 211, 212, 214, 217, 221, 229, 230, 231, 232, 236, 249, 250, 251, 260, 267, 268, 275, 277, 283.
Church in England, 10, 14, 92, 145, 154, 155.
Church indefectible, 11.
Church, Anglican, 44, 50.

Church, Dissenting, 54.
Church, Greek, 204, 206, 213.
Church, Mormon, 201.
Church, Russian, 189, 213.
Church unjustly condemned, demands a hearing, 12.
Churchman, The London, 128.
Cities of the Plain, 42, 43, 217.
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 99.
Clark, Dr. John, 277.
Clement of Alexandria, 64.
Clement, St., of Rome, 57, 95, 144, 245, 246, 276, 284.
Clergy invited to become enthused, 14.
Cloveshoo, Council of, 97.
Cobbett's History of the Reformation, 51, 210.
Coleridge, 170.
Colony without Papists, 341.
Columbanus, St., 115, 251.
Columbkill, 251.
Columbus, 22, 119, 180.
Commander-in-Chief in Christendom, 171, 227.
Conception, Immaculate, 43.
Constantine, 180.
Constantinople, 84, 128, 143, 167, 215, 216, 217, 235, 243, 246, 247, 251, 252.
Constantinople, 6th General Council of, 45.
Constantinople, 8th General Council of, 147.
Convocation, 97, 99, 100, 139, 156, 190, 203, 230, 279.
Co-operation earnestly invited, 14.
Corinthian and Corinthians, 57, 68, 141, 276.
Cornelius a Lapide, 31, 81.
Council, General, 24, 38, 84, 87, 88, 96, 112, 140, 197, 216, 237, 240, 257, 259, 261.
Council, Chalcedon, 85, 86, 227, 240, 243, 248, 257, 283, 284.
Council, Constantinople I, 252.
Council, Constantinople II, 85.
Council, Ephesus, 85, 86.
Council, Florence, 96, 104, 243.
Council, Lateran, 220.
Council, Lyons, 84, 243.
Council, Nice I, 85, 96, 108, 139, 151, 205, 238, 260, 261, 275, 280.
Council, Nice II, 240.
Council, Trent, 140, 176, 187, 191, 227, 248, 249, 255, 282, 286.
Council, Vatican, 110, 140, 227, 243.

Cranmer, 248, 255, 273, 286.
Creed, Anglican diminished, 134.
Creed, Apostles', 36, 160, 164, 268, 278.
Creed, Athanasian, 36, 113, 160, 268.
Creed, Nicene, 36, 160, 268.
Cromwell, Thomas, 101.
Cuthbert, St., 124.
Cyprian, St., 64, 124, 231, 275, 276.
Cyril, St., of Alexandria, 92, 246.
Cyril, St., of Jerusalem, 92, 225, 283, 287.

D.

Damasus, 59, 85, 90, 242.
Danes, 217, 231, 281.
Darling, Justice, 187.
Date acceptable to English-speaking people, 22.
D'Alembert, 174.
Decisions, American, 133, 168.
Decretals, 153.
Dedication, 1.
Deductions, 39.
Defamation of the Church was sure to follow, 72.
Did England once believe in the Papacy? 94.
Dionysius, St., of Alexandria, 67.
Dioscorus, 86, 141, 173.
Disgrace to call the spouse of Christ vile names, 12.
Dissensions, Christian, are outrages on Christ, 21.
Dissenters, 107, 155, 206.
Divorce, 19, 20.
Do the Fathers bear testimony to the Papacy? 89.
Donatists, 44, 166, 167, 220, 222, 275.
Dowie, John Alexander, 30.
Druids, 25.

E.

Earl of Essex, 53.
East, the, is awakening, 12.
Ecclesia Anglicana, 54, 100, 166, 222.
Ecclesia dispersa, 87.
Ecclesia docens, 42, 164, 250.
Ecclesia Elizabethana, 53, 55, 56, 70, 72, 99, 104, 116, 134, 135, 155, 161, 163, 177, 187, 199, 214, 222, 272.
Ecclesia Hibernica, 54.

Edinburgh, Congress in, 8, 161.
Editors, 124.
Edward the Confessor, 98, 118.
Edward VI, 138.
Edward VII, 162, 228.
Eleutherius, St., 53, 94.
Elizabeth, Queen, 20, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 65, 101, 107, 122, 138, 143, 156, 186, 190, 220, 236, 279.
Emporia Editor's Soliloquy, 299.
England, 10, 13, 18, 24, 26, 33, 35, 39, 41, 50, 51, 52, 53, 62, 65, 66, 69, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 115, 117, 118, 122, 124, 126, 128, 129, 136, 140, 142, 143, 148, 151, 153, 155, 158, 161, 163, 166, 167, 168, 177, 179, 181, 186, 187, 190, 191, 196, 198, 207, 210, 220, 222, 228, 230, 237, 245, 246, 251, 253, 257, 268, 281, 282, 288.
England's captains for a 1000 years, 76.
England's conversion difficult, 61.
Englishmen have not encouraged divorce, 20.
Englishmen should remember, 231.
Ephesus, 43, 53, 84, 95, 173, 184, 240, 243, 245.
Episcopalians, Protestant, 8.
Erasmus, 163.
Erin, 55, 125.
Eugenicus, Marcus, Archbishop of Ephesus, 84.
Eugenius, Pope, 84.
Eusebius, 246.
Eutyches and Eutychians, 44, 141, 282.
Exeter, 97, 98.

F.

Facts from Chalcedon, 283.
Facts to be granted, 37.
Faith, 6.
Faith as others see it, 6.
Faith, its necessity, 30.
Faith, truths of, 168, 170.
Fathers of the Church, 58, 59, 67, 151.
"Fear not, Ferryman," 251.
Fellingham, Rev. R. C., 55.
Filioque, 151, 177.
First Bishop in Christendom, 247.
Fisher, Cardinal, 138, 248, 253, 286.
Florence, General Council of, 83, 96.

Foreword, a, 8.
Formula of Hormisdas, 242.
Francis, St., of Assisi, 233.
Franciscans, 180.
French, 193.
Froude, 160, 250.
Fulke, 262.

G.

Gairdner, James, 101, 102, 136, 137, 183, 191, 196.
Galileo, 273.
Gallic, 193.
Gamaliel, 206.
Gasquet, Rt. Rev. Abbot, 276.
Gelasius, 242.
George V, 115, 122, 162, 228.
George Washington, 18, 274.
Germany, 120, 257.
Gibbon, Cardinal, 8, 26.
Gildas, 94.
Gladstone, W. E., 129, 157, 208, 237.
Gnostics, 44.
God wills unity, 147.
God's plan, 30.
Good Shepherd, 79.
Government Church, 34, 106, 108, 158, 159, 260, 261, 262.
Government, the English, 31, 108, 158.
Government, U. S., 108, 157, 201, 207.
Greek Church, 22, 167, 204, 206, 252, 261.
Gregory, St. I, the Great, 53, 84, 87, 96, 97, 110, 153, 167, 168, 178, 186, 218, 228, 248, 250, 251.
Gregory VII, 285.
Gregory, St., of Nazianzus, 62, 92.
Gregory, St., of Nyssa, 62, 92, 225.
Grosseteste, 253.
Grotius, 285.
Guarantee that the Church is right, 10.

H.

Halifax, Lord, 123, 153, 250.
Hallam, 255.
Harken to one that is English of the English, 274.
Harnack, 152.

Hart, Sir Robert, 114, 179.
Heath, Archbishop, 52.
Hedley, Bishop, 253.
Hefele, 243.
Hell, 64, 107.
Henry II, 99.
Henry IV of Germany, 237.
Henry VIII, 20, 50, 51, 52, 56, 65, 70, 99, 101, 118, 119, 120, 122, 134, 136, 143, 156, 165, 173, 184, 230, 236, 248, 252, 253.
Heptarchy, 36.
Heresies called after Founders, 262.
Heresy, 9, 19, 38, 56, 62, 64, 65, 66, 88, 112, 113, 122, 125, 152, 210.
Hildebrand, 236.
Hillary, St., 92.
His facts wrong, 335.
Homilies, 25.
Honorius, 183, 240, 273.
Honors to Pope Clement XI, 251.
Hope of the Earth, 300.
Hormisdas, 147, 150, 242.
How Chinese generally use Bible, 267.
Humor of it, 308.
Hurter, 235.
Hypostatic (Union), 43.

I.

Ignatius, St., 59, 95, 144, 216, 276.
Immaculate, unworthy repudiation of, 13.
Important facts in early History, 276.
Important retractation, 336.
Indefectibility, 38, 49.
India, 12, 33, 105, 162, 164, 184.
Infallibility, 38.
Innocent I, 247, 260.
Ireland, 52, 53, 54, 162, 210, 278.
Irenaeus, St., 89.
Irish a power to be reckoned with, 325.
Is one Church as good as another? 338.
Items from the Catholic Press, 232, 306.

J.

James I, 68, 70.
Japan, 33, 105, 115, 164, 184.

Japanese, 165, 233, 267, 270, 281.
Jehovah, 78.
Jerome, St., 57, 59, 60, 90, 152, 154, 196, 220, 262, 275.
Jerusalem, 139.
Jews, 57, 61, 119, 200, 203, 206.
John, St., Chrysostom, 58, 62, 66, 90, 197, 221, 225, 247.
John, St., the Evangelist, 53.
Jones, Rev. Spencer, 135.
Julius I, 68, 70.
Jurisdiction, 47, 51, 52, 79, 100, 140, 141, 142, 143, 153, 156, 187, 208, 210, 214, 248, 280.
Justin the Martyr, 262.

K.

Kempthorne, Bishop, 8.
Key-bearer, 39, 204, 256.
Key regarding Papal Supremacy, 238.
Knights Catholic invited to espouse the cause, 14.
Kingdom of God, 10, 12, 18, 37, 40, 41, 201, 204, 229, 256.

L.

La Marca, 154.
Lanfranc, 98, 99, 281.
Leo, St. I, the Great, 86, 92, 247, 248, 260.
Leo XIII, 138, 229, 244.
Let it be emphasized, 282.
Light of faith sinned against by England, 13.
Lightfoot, 152.
Lingard, 56, 94, 96, 99, 100, 139, 228, 249, 253, 280.
Littledale, 273.
Luther, 35, 69, 71, 99, 118, 119, 120, 143, 147, 149, 211, 215, 229, 232, 233, 241, 263, 277.
Lutheran and Lutherans, 61, 160, 239, 242, 262, 281.
Lyons, General Council of, 84.

M.

Macaulay, Lord, 12.
Magna Charta, 65, 208.
Magnus, Simon, 30.
Mahomet and Mahometanism, 12, 118, 203, 215, 229.
Malachias, prophecy of, 222, 224
Manning, Cardinal, 129, 222.

Marks of the True Church, 45.
Masaha, Dr., Japan, 12, 233.
Mass. The, 53, 139, 186, 198, 228, 232, 273.
Martyr, Modern, 269.
Martyrs, English, 253.
Mary, the Blessed Virgin, 13, 86, 121.
May redeem the name of George, 307.
Mayor of Tokio, 283.
Melanchthon, 232, 284, 285.
Messias, 40, 205.
Methodist, 210, 214, 219, 263, 264, 267, 272.
Meyer, historian, 152.
Mikado, The, 115, 116, 117.
Millman, 152.
Milner, 175, 190, 211, 215, 262, 264.
Miracles of St. Augustine, 218.
Miscellaneous, 281.
Mission, 114, 115, 142, 143, 151.
Modern Martyr, 269.
Modernists, 44, 241, 315.
Monophysistes, 44, 166, 167, 243.
Monothelites, 44, 183.
Montanists, 276.
Moravian, 263.
More, Sir Thomas, 138, 156, 248, 253, 276, 286.
Mormon Church, 201.
Moscow, 143.

N.

Nampon, Father, S. J., 12.
Napoleon's dying testimony, 283.
Necessity of knowing precisely Christ's teaching, 28.
Nestorius and Nestorians, 44, 243, 244, 246, 275, 282.
Newcastle, Protestant Bishop of, 55.
Newman, Cardinal, 92, 203, 232, 250, 255, 257, 276.
Niagara Falls got the name of St. Anthony. 180.
Nice, first council of, 42, 96, 280.
Non-Catholic signs of the times, 297.
Non-Catholic testimony, 238.
Non-Catholics, 9, 123, 133, 166, 201, 202, 250, 257, 284
Non-Conformists, 71, 117, 123, 135, 155, 163, 177, 230, 232.
Norfolk, Duke of, 54, 135.
Notanda, 3.

O.

Olshausen, 153.
O'Hern, Rev. L. J., 261.
Optatus, St., 64, 92.
Orders, Holy, 142.
Orient and Orientals, 33, 54, 87, 105, 128, 164, 267, 268, 269.
Origen, 188.
Oxford, 263.

P.

Pacian, St., 151.
Pagans and Paganism, 12, 161, 169, 179, 199, 239.
Papacy, 75, 76, 103, 115, 119, 150, 151, 152, 154, 162, 163, 178, 189, 191, 195, 231, 232, 254, 265.
Papacy needed daily, 334.
Paraclete, 10, 38, 43, 166.
Parliament, 52, 55, 56, 65, 66, 68, 104, 135, 138, 141, 187, 188, 190, 208, 219, 228, 248.
Patriarch, 66, 88, 128, 134.
Paul, St., 53, 57, 68, 94, 95, 96, 109, 111, 125, 144, 148, 176, 195, 197, 199, 222, 223, 235, 249, 254, 256, 258.
Paul, James Francis, Rev., 135, 181.
Pauline doctrine special, 94.
Pelagians, 44.
Pelagius, 252.
Pentecost, 31, 37, 166.
People generally like the right and true, 11.
Persons should never forget, 174, 197.
Peter's distinctions, 80, 82.
Peter's special dignity, 76.
Peter's Pence, 98.
Philistines, 70.
Phocios, 143, 214, 216.
Pity for prodigals, 9.
Pius X, 8, 32, 57, 77, 100, 120, 128, 129, 144, 236, 241, 266.
Plato, 175.
Plutarch, 175
Polycarp, St., 95, 216.
Practice of Paul, 222.
Praemunire, 101, 197.
Prayer Book, The, 87, 92, 140, 228.
Precillians, 44.
Prejudice, 8, 150.

Pre-Reformation, 249, 261.
Presbyterians, 8, 210, 239, 258, 279.
Primacy, 24, 76, 79, 85, 104, 108, 156, 216, 248.
Printing, 11.
Prophecy of Malachias, 222.
Propositions, 132.
Protestant, 179.
Protestant Episcopal, 179.
Protestantism, 9, 134, 145, 146, 173, 209, 239.

Q.

Questions asked by Orientals, 268.
Quivil, Peter, 97.

R.

Ratcliffe, Rev. R., 204, 223.
Real Presence, 95, 195, 203, 232, 233, 260, 283, 287.
Reconciliation, Ministry of, 185.
Reformers, 69, 211.
Reformation, 70, 101, 134, 155, 163, 190, 196, 230, 250 258, 276.
Rejecting Rome is rejection of Rome's honors, 273.
Religious Orders asked to co-operate, 14.
Review, brief American, 131.
Reunion, 22, 128, 151, 169, 172, 173.
Romans, 54, 95.
Rome, 38, 53, 56, 66, 68, 70, 99, 106, 112, 140, 143, 148, 152, 153, 157, 159, 161, 177, 179, 187, 190, 206, 208, 228, 231, 236, 239, 251, 253, 254, 255, 264, 275, 276.
Rome the goal of unity, 8.
Russian Church, 189, 213, 215.
Ryle, Most Rev. Dr., 34.

S.

Sacraments, 39, 41, 46, 49, 53, 106, 107, 118, 119, 121, 122, 149, 156, 160, 176, 177, 178.
Sacrilege, 65.
Salmon, historian, 153.
Samson, 70.
Sanctity, 46.
Sardica, 25, 96, 241, 244.
Saviour's sign to the world, 32.
Saul of Tarsus, 174.

Schism, 9, 19, 24, 32, 38, 46, 50, 58, 59, 67, 122, 123, 125,
Schismatic, Schismatical, 134, 143, 144, 152, 156, 157, 163, 167, 168, 178, 187, 210, 213, 243, 248, 252, 262, 275, 288.
Scotland, 241, 262.
Scripture or Scriptures, 19, 30, 42, 61, 67, 68, 69, 78, 97, 118, 144, 146, 150, 151, 162, 163, 182, 184, 196, 197, 202, 211, 235, 264, 265.
Secessionists, 150.
Seymour, Rt. Rev. Geo. F., 142.
Shipwreck of Protestantism, 307.
Short, historian, 250.
Sickness, sweating, the, 214.
Signs of the times favorable to reunion, 8, 301.
Simon Peter, 78, 83.
Siricius, St., 109.
Smith, historian, 153.
Societies Catholic invited to co-operate, 14.
Some conclusions that lead to reunion, 299.
Special interest to Methodists, 263.
Starbuck, Rev. C. C., 150.
Stephen, Pope, 238, 276.
Stephen, St., the first Christian martyr, 125.
Succession, Apostolic, 271.
Supremacy, Papal, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 118, 119, 139, 143, 151, 156, 179, 194, 210, 216, 217, 249.
Supremacy, Royal, 51, 52, 55, 56.
Susanna wrongfully accused, 11.

T.

Temple, Most Rev. Archbishop, 229.
Tertullian, 177, 276.
Testament, New, 30, 37, 81, 118, 144, 145, 155, 193, 199, 224, 232, 239, 264, 288.
Texts, the four Petrine, 81.
Theodoret, 242.
Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, 177, 215.
Things, three, to be proved, 72.
Thomas a Becket, St., 99, 118, 124, 128, 249.
Tichborne, 162.
Time for England to return to unity, 126.
Tokio, 233.

Transubstantiation, 139, 186, 218, 226, 248, 287.
Tribute of Gladstone to the Church, 208.
Turk, 84, 105.

U.

Unauthorized Protestant services.
Unbeliever condemned, 31.
United States, 157, 199.
Union among Christians,
Unitarians, 275.
Unity, 10, 14, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 58, 64, 65, 67, 75, 101, 105, 110, 123, 147, 150, 155, 162, 164, 165, 211, 219, 244, 255, 258, 264, 265, 276, 288.
Universality, 47.

V.

Vatican Council, 83, 110.
Vaughan, 34, 253, 274, 275, 279.
Vicar of Christ, 23, 51, 53, 54, 57, 79, 99, 118, 120, 156.
Vicegerent holds the keys of the kingdom, 12.
Victor, Pope, 238, 276.
Vigilantius, 275.
Vigilius, 273.
Voice of the Catholic press, 306.
Voices from the days of faith, 276.

W.

Walton, 196.
Ware, historian, 53, 186.
Washington, George, 18, 254.
Watson, 177.
We appreciate what is sterling, 252.
Weld-Brundell, Charles, 251.
Wesley, John, 219, 263, 272.
Wesleyans, 61, 160, 179.
Wesleyan reform union, 8.
Westminster, Synod of, 99.
Whately, 170.
What a distinguished Briton says, 304.
What cause nobler than this? 14.
What deed more knightly than this? 14.
What Luther taught, 233.

What Peter does as the First, 80.
What the renowned Newman says, 250.
"Which?" 286.
While the Papacy "lasted," 241.
Whitehead, Dr., 263.
Whitfield, 264.
Why Dr. Amieux became a Catholic, 339.
Why persecutest thou Me? 247.
Wilfrid, St., 45.
Wilkins, 99, 261.
William the Conqueror, 99, 280, 281.
Winchester Council, 281.
Wiseman, Cardinal, 253.
Words of praise from the mayor of Tokio, 233.
Words sincere and telling, 250.
Wycliffe, 215, 228, 286.

X.

Xavier, St. Francis, 21, 165.

Y.

Yearning for Mother Church, 285.
York, 98.
York, Archbishop of, 45, 123.
Yorktown, 142.

Z.

Zerta, Council of, 220.
Zwinglius, 35, 229, 233.

End of Part I.

150 @ 1 ~ m

280.2A
P51

Phelan, Rev. John

An appeal for unity in

280.2A
P51

D